DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 184 412 HE 012 426

AUTHOR Gruson, Edward S.
TITLE Developing Institutions: Background and Policy Alternatives. Working Paper.
SPONS AGENCY Sloan Commission on Government and Higher Education, Cambridge, Mass.
PUB DATE Dec 78
NOTE 81p.; For related Sloan Commission documents, see ED 161 306, ED 176 679, ED 179 174, ED 180 273, HE 012 421-427, HE 012 429-432, HE 012 434-439, HE 012 442-445, HE 012 448-449, HE 012 465-474, HE 012 476-480, HE 012 482-490.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Black Colleges; Black Students; College Desegregation; Community Colleges; Compliance (Legal); Court Litigation; *Developing Institutions; *Educational Legislation; *Federal Aid; *Government School Relationship; Grants; Higher Education; Public Policy; State Colleges
IDENTIFIERS Adams v Califano; *Higher Education Act Title III; *Sloan Commission Studies

ABSTRACT

Background information and policy issues regarding programs for the support of the historically black colleges are presented. The unique characteristics, qualities, and contributions of these black institutions are reviewed, and the implications of the Adams v. Califano case are discussed. Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965 established the federal program that supports developing institutions through grants-in-aid. The Adams v. Califano decision requires compliance with desegregation legislation and stipulates that states with dual systems of higher education should enhance historically black public colleges. It is noted that for some minority students, it is not clear that a totally integrated institution is educationally the most beneficial or productive environment. Five strategies to be considered in developing programs of support for institutions are as follows: (1) continue the present Title III program; (2) intensify the focus of Title III for the support of the historically black colleges; (3) eliminate the set-aside for community and junior colleges; (4) add an endowment component to Title III; and (5) provide low income and minority student-based collegiate opportunity grants. Appended are the legislative history and funding history of the Title III program, Title III program characteristics, a listing of historically black colleges and universities that are still predominantly black, and a list of newer predominantly black colleges. (SW)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED184412

Sloan Commission on Government

and Higher Education

(Working Paper)

# DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

# BACKGROUND AND POLICY ALTERNATIVES

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Sloan Comm

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Edward S. Gruson

December 1978

HE 012 426

TABLE OF CONTENTS


| | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| List of Tables | | ii |
| Acknowledgement | | iv |
| SUMMARY | | 1 |
| I. | CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES | 5 |
| II. | THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES | 11 |
| III. | THE IMPLICATIONS OF ADAMS V. CALIFANO | 17 |
| IV. | POLICY ISSUES | 22 |
| V. | POLICY ALTERNATIVES | 25 |
| | 1. Continue to Present the Title III Program | 25 |
| | 2. Make Explicit the Intent of Title III to Support Traditionally Black Colleges and Newer Predominantly Black Colleges | 26 |
| | 3. Eliminate the Set-Aside for Community and Junior Colleges | 27 |
| | 4. Add an Endowment Component to Title III | 27 |
| | 5. Minority and Low-Income Student-Based Collegiate Opportunity Grants (COG) | 28 |
| Appendices | | 31 |
| Appendix A: | Legislative History and Evolution of the Title III Program | 32 |
| | A - Legislative History and Funding History | 33 |
| | B - Funding History and Some Program Characteristics | 54 |
| Appendix B: | Listing A - Historically Black Colleges and Universities (Which Are Still Predominantly Black) | 65 |
| | Listing B - Newer Predominantly Black Colleges | 69 |
| Notes | | 70 |

## TABLES


| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | PERCENTAGE AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF BLACKS ENROLLED IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, FALL 1976 | 7 |
| 2 | DEGREES AWARDED TO BLACKS AS A PERCENT OF TOTAL DEGREE RECIPIENTS, 1975-76 | 8 |
| 3 | DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY IN HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES | 10 |
| 4 | FOURTEEN BLACK PUBLIC COLLEGES AND COMPETITORS | 21 |
| 5 | CHARACTERISTICS OF DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS | 35 |
| 6 | CHARACTERISTICS OF FUNDED DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS 1967 | 40 |
| 7 | QUANTITATIVE MEASURES OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY (1971) | 42 |
| 8 | CHARACTERISTICS HAVING A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPORT IN ELIGIBILITY AND FUNDING (1973-74) | 45 |
| 9 | TITLE III OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS, PERCENTILES FOR FY '74 GRANTEES (AIDP AND BIDP) USING DATA FROM 1974 APPLICATIONS | 47 |
| 10 | TITLE III - FUNDING EXPERIENCE | 56 |
| 11 | TITLE II, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS, BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 57 |
| 12 | TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS, ADVANCED INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 58 |
| 13 | TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS, BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM | 59 |
| 14 | ADVANCED INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM, TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965, SUMMARY OF FISCAL YEARS 1973-1976 | 60 |
| 15 | TITLE III, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM: PERCENTILE OF FUNDS TO MINORITIES OF TOTAL APPROPRIATION, FISCAL YEARS 1966-1976 | 61 |

| Number | | Page |
|---|---|---|
| 16 | TITLE III, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS: NUMBER OF GRANTS AND AMOUNTS AWARDED TO MINORITIES FISCAL YEARS 1971-1976 | 62 |
| 17 | MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS, BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM | 63 |
| 18 | PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS - SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION | 64 |

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special thanks are owed to Drs. Albert Berrian, Elias Blake, Jr., Christopher F. Edley, Willis J. Hubert, Sherman J. Jones, George A. Owens, Cecil Patterson, Benjamin F. Payton, Thelma Roundtree, Jesse Stowe, W. Clyde Williams and Wayne M. Wormley.

They all gave generously and patiently of their time, experience and wisdom.

David O. Levine of the Commission staff found and skillfully organized much of the data. He wrote Section I. He served, during the course of this paper, as an essential and critical sounding-board.

Irene Spero successfully undertook to seek out and find information necessary to the paper in Washington, D.C. She conducted interviews at Howard University and with current and former staff-members of the Office of Education. These too were essential.

## SUMMARY

This paper deals with Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965, the federal program which supports "Developing Institutions" by means of institutional grants-in-aid.

The original intent of the program was to provide financial assistance for the historically Black colleges.

Only to some extent has it succeeded in achieving this end. Because it is impossible to define the term "Developing Institutions" precisely, the array of colleges and universities receiving Title III grants has become very broad. Small, predominantly white, financially weak colleges serving a middle class student body are increasingly applying for and receiving grants under this Title. In addition, Congress has mandated that twenty-four percent of the funds appropriated be earmarked for community and junior colleges. More recently, colleges which provide increasing educational opportunities for Spanish-speaking and American Indian populations have become eligible for Title III grants. Consequently, the original intent of Congress has become diluted and is threatened with even greater attenuation.

In 1966 there were 120, more or less, historically Black colleges which enrolled 139,444 students. By 1976 there were only 104 such colleges which enrolled, however, 203,800 students, (see Appendix B for a list of the historically Black colleges and the newer predominantly Black colleges).

In 1966, although $55 million had been authorized for Title III only $5 million were appropriated. In that same year, 536 applications for grants were received by the Office of Education and 158 awards were made. By 1977 (data for 1978 are not yet available) authorizations reached

$120 million of which $110 million were appropriated. In that year the number of proposals submitted had risen above a thousand and the number of awards made was 283. In 1966 the funds requested by institutions in their applications were just over $32 million. By 1976 the funds requested had reached $1.6 billion. Clearly the felt needs were much greater than the resources available. A more complete review of the legislative history and the funding history of this program is contained in Appendix A.

The unique characteristics, qualities and contributions of the historically Black colleges are reviewed and summarized. The major conclusion reached in this review is that these colleges, the majority of which have a policy of open enrollment, provide access to higher education for a substantial number of students from poor and minority families who otherwise would be unlikely to attend college. The historically Black colleges do not merely provide an educational opportunity for low-income and minority students. They are better able to fund, matriculate and graduate minority and low-income students than are most predominantly white colleges and universities. To this extent they are a national resource since they contribute so heavily to the achievement of national educational policy.

From a policy perspective, programs for the support of the historically Black colleges might better be based on this function which they perform so well.

The implications of the decision in the Adams v. Califano case are far-reaching and potentially threatening to the historically Black public colleges. In the long run it is likely that these colleges and universities will become integrated. Charles V. Willie suggests that

predominantly Black institutions (two-thirds Black and one-third white) are essential for the educational and cultural experience of both races. In the short run the competition between and among the historically Black public colleges and the historically Black private colleges will increase in intensity. The FTE-driven budgets of public Black institutions are likely to fuel the competition for students. The problem of resolving the issues created by the Adams v. Califano decision will be especially difficult in those cities in which two public institutions of higher education, one primarily white and the other historically Black, are located. How can the historically Black public institution be assured of survival? The solution of the problems generated by such a situation will require extraordinary sensitivity and skill and are not likely to be resolved in a short period of time.

Finally, for some minority students at least, it is not clear that a totally integrated institution is educationally the most beneficial or productive environment.

There are probably five strategies to be considered in developing programs of support for institutions of which the historically Black colleges are prime examples:

1) Continue the present Title III program. Changes in the award mechanism to reduce the potential for arbitrary decisions might be introduced. It is difficult, however, to be sanguine about whether or not Congress will appropriate sufficient funds for this program to do the job well.

2) Intensify the focus of Title III for the support of the historically Black colleges. By analogy with the Public Works

Employment Act Congress could earmark a proportion of the appropriations for historically Black colleges and newer predominantly Black colleges. Presently, these institutions receive about fifty-one percent of the funds appropriated. It may be possible to increase this to sixty percent.

3) Eliminate the set-aside for community and junior colleges. Such action would make twenty-four percent of the appropriated funds available for distribution among eligible four-year colleges. Politically it would be difficult, perhaps impossible, to persuade Congress to take this step.

4) Add an endowment component to Title III. Increased appropriations for Title III might be earmarked for grants and loans to the historically Black colleges and universities on a matching basis. This would supplement and complement a program being developed by the United Negro College Fund. The income from the investment of the federal and private loans would be used in part for operations, in part for repayment of the loan, and in part to build an unrestricted endowment fund for the participating institutions.

5) Low income and minority student based Collegiate Opportunity Grants: Those colleges and universities, whether predominantly or historically Black or white, which serve primarily the "lower third," would receive grants determined by the proportion of the total student body receiving BEOG awards and the proportion of that group eligible to receive the maximum BEOG at any particular institution.

## I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

Despite the fact that more Black Americans between the ages of 18 and 24 are high school dropouts than are enrolled in college, Blacks have made enormous strides in education. According to data from the United States Bureau of the Census, 35 percent of all Blacks in the 18-to-24 age cohort were high school dropouts in 1967; today, that figure has dropped to 24 percent.[1] At the same time that Blacks have been completing high school in increasing numbers, so has the percentage of Blacks with a college education grown. The Institution for Services to Education reports that the proportion of Blacks aged 25-to-35 with four years of college has doubled since 1966.[2] These statistics demonstrate that although Blacks have not yet achieved the same levels of educational attainment as the majority, considerable progress has been made.

All categories of institutions have enjoyed the fruits of the growth in enrollment of Black students in the past decade. A Ford Foundation report written last summer estimated that the number of Blacks in post-secondary education has grown from 470,000 in 1970 to at least 915,000 in 1978; whereas Blacks comprised only 5.8 percent of the total national enrollment in the former year, at the present time, they represent 8.0 percent.[3] In 1966, 139,444 students were enrolled in the historically Black colleges; in 1976, 203,800 students were attending these 104 institutions. Yet, this 46 percent increase in the enrollment in the historically Black colleges was still overshadowed by the huge leaps in Black enrollment in other sectors of American higher education: during this period, the percentage of Blacks enrolled in the historically Black colleges fell from 48 percent of the total Black enrollment in 1966 to 18 percent in 1976.[4] Thus, not only have the historically Black colleges

expanded in the 1970s, but important other types of institutions have evolved to meet the needs of Black young people.

Perhaps most significant is the network of "newer predominantly Black colleges" which has emerged in recent years. The National Advisory Committee on Blacks in Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities has identified 42 schools as "institutions which have been recently established or were founded for the general population but because of their geographical location, are now predominantly Black."[5] Today, 12 percent of the Blacks enrolled in higher education are educated at the NPBCs. These institutions, which include a number of four- and two-year urban colleges, have enormous growth potential in the years to come as the number of young Blacks and the percentage of young Blacks attending college both continue to increase.

The largest proportion of Blacks in higher education can be found in the two-year colleges. In 1976, 46 percent of all Black college students attended a two-year community college; in contrast, approximately one-third of all white students were enrolled in a two-year program. In the fall of 1976, over one-half of all first-time Black freshmen entered these schools. Many worry that while access to post-secondary education is improving for Blacks, an ever-increasing percentage of Blacks are entering institutions which will have little impact on their upward mobility.

Table 1 details the distribution of Blacks enrolled in higher education by type of institution. Although 1976 data showed that 11.0 percent of the first-time freshmen and 10.2 percent of all undergraduates were Black,[6] this data reveals that serious inequities still exist at the most prestigious type of institution, the university. Both private and public universities apparently still fail to attract large numbers of minority students. The data in Table 1 also suggests that the progress Blacks have made in educational attainment has been limited.

TABLE 1

PERCENTAGE AND FREQUENCY DISTRIBUTIONS OF BLACKS ENROLLED IN COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES, BY TYPE OF INSTITUTION, FALL 1976

| Type of Institution | Total Black Enrollment (all institutions) | | Percent Enrolled in... | | | Percent Black Students of All Higher Education Students |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | HBC'S | NPBC's | Other than HBC'S/NPBC'S | |
| All Institutions | 1,034,680 | 100.0 | 17.8 | 11.9 | 70.3 | 9.3 |
| Public | 832,866 | 100.0 | 14.8 | 13.5 | 71.7 | 9.6 |
| Private | 201,814 | 100.0 | 29.9 | 5.4 | 64.7 | 8.4 |
| All Universities | 150,217 | 100.0 | 8.1 | - | 91.9 | 5.4 |
| Public | 104,908 | 100.0 | 4.7 | - | 95.3 | 5.0 |
| Private | 45,309 | 100.0 | 16.0 | - | 84.0 | 6.5 |
| All 4 Year | 455,170 | 100.0 | 35.9 | 5.5 | 58.6 | 10.4 |
| Public | 318,499 | 100.0 | 35.4 | 6.5 | 58.1 | 11.2 |
| Private | 136,671 | 100.0 | 37.1 | 3.2 | 59.7 | 8.9 |
| All 2 Year | 429,293 | 100.0 | 0.2 | 22.9 | 76.9 | 11.0 |
| Public | 409,459 | 100.0 | 1.5 | 22.4 | 76.1 | 10.9 |
| Private | 19,834 | 100.0 | 11.7 | 32.3 | 56.0 | 13.2 |

Source: Preliminary data on Fall 1976 enrollment from DHEW, National Center for Educational Statistics.

TABLE 2

DEGREES AWARDED TO BLACKS AS A PERCENT
OF TOTAL DEGREE RECIPIENTS
1975-76

| Type of Degree | Total Degrees Awarded | Percent Awarded to Blacks |
|---|---|---|
| Associate Degrees (or other awards below the Baccalaureate) | 489,075 | 8.4 |
| Baccalaureates | 929,918 | 6.4 |
| Master's | 311,177 | 6.5 |
| First Professional | 62,494 | 4.3 |
| Doctorates | 33,800 | 3.5 |

Source: Page 23, National Advisory Committee

Although this paper pays its closest attention to undergraduate education, it should be noted that a great deal needs to be done to increase the numbers of Black graduate and professional students. The Institute for Services to Education has addressed itself to this point:

> The most salient factor to be emphasized here is that population trends will have little impact on the Black status in higher education unless interventions are introduced to not only attract significantly large numbers of Blacks into undergraduate and graduate schools, but to insure that they move through various levels of post-secondary education at reasonable graduate rates.[7]

The historically Black colleges play a particularly effective role in this regard.

The historically Black colleges continue to provide a major source of the Black baccalaureate degrees nationally. Although they matriculate less than 20 percent of the Black students enrolled in American colleges, the HBC's conferred 37 percent of the baccalaureate degrees awarded in 1976 to Blacks.[8] Although definitive data is not yet available, it is widely believed that the HBC's have a far lower attrition rate than other institutions have for their minority students. Part of their success may be attributed to the close personal attention these students receive: the

41 public HBC's enroll an average of 3,451 students; the 63 private HBC's enroll but an average of 989.[9] The HBC's have a vital role in the higher education system of the South; in 1974, the HBC's matriculated over 50 percent of the Black students in 8 states.[10] Clearly, HBC's contribute both to the quality of education received and to broadening the number of those who enjoy access to it.

In his Report on Entering College Freshmen, Fall 1976, Alexander Astin dramatically demonstrated the role the historically Black colleges play in insuring access to higher education for students from a wide range of socio-economic levels. Whereas only 20.2 percent of all freshmen in four-year majority institutions came from families with incomes of less than $10,000, 62.2 percent of the HBC freshmen were from such poor families. Well over twice as many freshmen at majority institutions have a father with at least some college education as their peers at Black colleges.[11] The HBC's rightfully take a great deal of pride in opening their doors to students from disadvantaged backgrounds.

Other demographic information shed light on the student body at Black colleges. Although for all recipients nationally, males outnumber females, for Blacks, females outnumbered males at the associate, baccalaureate, and master's levels. In the historically Black colleges, women comprise over 51 percent of the full-time enrollment at the public institutions and over 52 percent at the private schools.[12] In addition, ISE data points out that a disproportionate number of the students at HBC's concentrate in education, the humanities, or in a social science. Business and management also continues to grow more popular. Unfortunately the biological and physical sciences lag far behind; much needs to be done to encourage Black students to enter the sciences and health professions.

As we have already noted, Blacks received only 3.6 percent of the doctorates awarded in the United States in 1975-76; in that same year, Blacks held 4.4 percent of the faculty positions at American colleges and universities.[13] A different picture is painted at the historically Black colleges. A 1977 ISE survey showed that 65 percent of the faculty at the HBC's were Black Americans.

TABLE 3

DISTRIBUTION OF FACULTY IN HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES

| Race | Number | Percent |
|---|---|---|
| Total | 8,305 | 100 |
| Black American | 5,386 | 65 |
| White American | 2,297 | 28 |
| Foreign Non-White | 333 | 4 |
| Foreign White | 203 | 2 |
| Other | 88 | 1 |

Source: Preliminary results of a survey of faculty in historically Black colleges, Spring 1977, by Institute for Services to Education, Inc.

The same study reported that 30 percent of the HBC's faculty had earned a Ph.D.; in addition, 8 percent had an Ed.D. and 53 percent a Master's degree.[14] ISE concluded, "Black faculty are underrepresented in relation to the proportion of Black students in higher education, and they are paid less than their white counterparts."[15]

## II. THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES

A review of the legislative and administrative changes in the Federal Program for Strengthening the Developing Institutions of Higher Education indicates that, over time, the original purpose of the program - to provide institutional aid to the historically Black colleges - has been diluted and attentuated. It is appropriate therefore to review the unique qualities and contributions of the historically Black colleges and the newer predominantly Black colleges to American higher education and to American society. A review is important for a number of reasons. First, recent writings suggest that a critical change is occuring within the community of Black scholars and administrators as they attempt to redefine the rationale for federal assistance. Secondly, the newer rationale has implications for a group of institutions more numerous than the historically Black colleges and might lead to creative new approaches to education at elementary and secondary school levels as well as colleges and universities. The historically Black colleges may prove to be a model to be emulated rather than only "strengthened" or "developed."

Among the elements which are being knitted together to generate the newer rationale for federal assistance are a few of the traditional arguments concerning diversity: Black educators stress the moral obligation of the country to Black colleges as well as the moral obligation of graduates of Black colleges to the community and the nation. As Samuel Du Bois Cook says, "The Black college and the Black-college graduate have a peculiar moral and social obligation to help sensitize this nation's conscience; to insist on the need for profound changes in social morality and patterns of behavior; to heighten social concern and ethical responsibility."[1] Yet, an ethical role and responsibility, according to Cook, are important but

not sufficient. There must also be excellence. He continues, "Topflight Blacks in the professions and in other key leadership positions, because of their statures, self-confidence, independence and influence as models, are likely to make a much greater contribution to social reform and community improvement than Blacks, whatever their ideology and rhetoric, who represent professional incompetence and failure. Other community goals are no substitute for excellence."[2] Charles V. Willie, Professor of Education and Urban Studies at Harvard University, quotes Robert K. Merton's point that "it is not infrequently the case that the non-conforming minority in a society represents the interests and ultimate values of the group more effectively than the conforming majority."[3] These values, among others, have been maintained and nurtured by the historically Black colleges and their graduates.

Discussion of the historically Black colleges has often, but only in part, dealt with their dual functions. The origin of this polarity was the "debate" between W. E. Du Bois, who promoted the liberal arts and encouraged the "talented tenth," and Booker T. Washington, whose strategy emphasized industrial and practical education for larger numbers of people. In the more recent literature the Black colleges are credited with resolving this paradox by evolving into institutions providing a career-oriented education in a liberal arts context. The Black colleges have responded to the opening of career opportunities in the '60's which earlier had been closed to Blacks. Whereas teacher training had been along with education for the ministry, the major objectives of their curricula, now almost all emphasize the preparation of students for careers in an enormous variety of skills and occupations as well as for post-baccalaureate studies.

Integration within the context of the Black experience, rather than overwhelming that tradition, is the sine qua non. In addition the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities in its first annual report, Higher Education Equity: The Crisis of Appearance Versus Reality, emphasizes, among other important matters, access and especially the "unique role of the historically Black colleges in enrolling and graduating large numbers of Black and low-income students."

At a meeting of the Developing Institutions Study Group in July 1977, Dr. Elias Black Jr. stessed this point and set it into a race-free context by describing "access" as the critical issue for the "lower third" of white, Black and all other minority students.

> Ten years ago then the big push started for equality of educational opportunity in higher education, the two-year institutions did not really exist as a basic component. So, access was really aimed at four year institutions which would give you Baccalaureate degrees which in turn would give you a pull for the higher level graduate and professional school competences. So to make a long story short, the world has not really advanced very much for this lower third when you define it. Then if you put in the institutional base to start with; it is just beginning ... Therefore, the question which I always raise in terms of the business of achieving national goals, has to do with whether there are classes of institutions which make a disproportionate contribution to achieve some national goal.
>
> Now, that is not racially exclusive either. It also defines some white institutions which are involved in dealing with the lower third of white students. It may not have a Black student anywhere near the place. But if they are serving a disproportionate role in terms of achieving a certain kind of educational opportunity in terms of national goals.

It is the affirmation and assertion of this mission which appears more frequently and with greater priority in the more recent discussions of Black colleges.

The rapid change in the traditional curriculum attests to the dynamic quality of these institutions. And, Title III should be credited in large measure with stimulating and making such changes possible. The historian Henry Allen Bullock cogently states that "a Black college must be two schools in one. First, it must prepare its students for full and efficient participation in a WASP-dominated society from whose overpowering influence they cannot escape; second, it must train them for a world of Blackness in which they must live." Gregory Kannerstein suggests that "Black colleges must solve the problems of welding divergent educational approaches into a working synthesis." The dilemma of liberal arts vs. career-oriented education is resolved by demonstrating their interdependence.

Yet an older theme is emerging with a newer emphasis. By definition, Black colleges in the South have been the main (at times the only) higher education resource for Blacks in any income class. Their role as experienced, successful institutions of higher education for minority and students from low-income families is receiving increasing attention, perhaps as a model for the nation. A survey of Black college presidents indicates that they consider four aspects of these institutions as unique. These are:

1. Admission of students at any level of preparedness.
2. Individualized attention.
3. Active and effective outreach for students and involvement in the community.
4. A career orientation within the context of a liberal arts education.

Kannerstein suggests that open enrollment is the single most important theme for a Black college. He believes that heterogeneity of Black students by social class, urban and rural mix, religion, low and moderate-income socio-economic status is as important to the education experience as integration.

These colleges are different. They emphasize a remarkably supportive teaching program for students who are generally very poor and have had meagre elementary and secondary school educations. They offer an affective, visceral experience which nurtures and motivates these students to achieve The motivation may be created in part by the pressure, even "somewhat coercive pressure" (as several presidents remarked) from the teaching faculty to perform well, but also by peer pressure from students. The pervasive sense of accomplishment of graduates and Black notables and the intangible effect of living within "the Black experience" contribute in substantial measure to their success as well.

These institutions are committed to teaching and most often, especially in the private sector, to creative, novel and, in the main, successful forms of remedial education. In this sense they provide both access and opportunity: access for those for whom standardized tests are inappropriate and who otherwise would remain outside the higher education system: opportunity for these same students who, because retention rates are higher in these colleges, are prepared for careers in fields unthinkable only a few years past.

The traditional, predominantly white two and four year colleges simply do not have the capability to provide the educational services needed by this sector of the student population. Most would exclude them as not meeting their entrance requirements. Private institutions find it difficult, and often public institutions are unwilling, to invest in needed remedial programs. In addition, most are unwilling to adopt and change their curricula to emphasize the teaching qualities so vital to the many previously disadvantaged students now entering post-secondary education.

The Black colleges are uniquely qualified to provide the type of education and the quality of support necessary to prepare both large

numbers of low income and minority students for productive contributions to society and to identify the "talented tenth" for post-graduate and professional careers.

## III. THE IMPLICATIONS OF ADAMS V. CALIFANO

In his decision in this case, Judge Pratt ruled that the "desegregation process should take into account the unequal status of the Black colleges and the real danger that desegregation will diminish higher education opportunities for Blacks." In addition, the guidelines demand that steps be taken by those states with dual systems of higher education to "enhance" historically Black public colleges. In short, Judge Pratt ordered HEW to take "into account the unique importance of Black colleges and at the same time comply with the Congressional mandate" when drafting criteria for desegregation plans. The policy issues generated are many fold: will the states "enhance" the public Black colleges? What form of "enhancement" will take place? More especially, will the historically Black public colleges survive as predominantly Black?

It is unclear what the effect will be on the historically Black public colleges of an increase in the enrollment of Black students in the historically white public colleges and universities. It is possible that, as a result of an enhancement policy which results in a broader curriculum and additional professional and post-baccalaureate programs, the historically Black colleges will be induced to become increasingly selective. If such a change were to come about, an important aim of these colleges, to identify, support and graduate previously educationally disadvantaged students, will be modified to the detriment of the institution and the student. If enhancement takes the form of increasing funds for remediation at only the historically Black public institutions without similar support at the traditionally white institutions, then

the ability of the historically white public colleges and universities to increase and retain their proportion of Black students will diminish correspondingly. The most serious danger is that the historically white institutions will matriculate substantial numbers of Black students who, because of the lack of support, services and other reasons, will soon drop out. The criteria of Adams v. Califano address the problem of retention; it has been claimed, however, that in some non-Adams-effected states, some large, historically white public institutions are establishing a revolving door policy for Black students in order to meet federally-mandated guidelines.

As funds for the historically Black public colleges and universities increase, there will be an increasing competition with the historically Black private colleges. A combination of low tuitions and "enhancement" may serve to make it more difficult for the small Black private institutions to survive. The nature of state funding of public higher education may serve to fuel this competition. Notwithstanding "enhancement," the public Black colleges will depend on their FTE for the bulk of their budget. In the short run, especially as the college-age cohort declines, the competition for students cannot help but be fierce.

Higher education in the United States prides itself on its diversity. Diversity shows up most prominently in the private sector of higher education. Yet, as a consequence of Adams v. Califano, an educationally and culturally diverse subset of institutions, the historically Black private colleges, are threatened. An unanticipated consequence of Adams v. Califano may be to create the conditions for the merger of private Black colleges among themselves or with public institutions. Mergers

among private Black institutions may have to come about in order to improve their competitive position in the face of competition from the traditionally Black or predominantly white public institutions.

A much more difficult problem is faced by historically Black public colleges located in close proximity to predominantly white public institutions. A list of these appears at the end of this section. Shall both institutions in any specific locality survive? Under what conditions? If they were to be merged which would be the surviving institution? Can enrollment policies be developed which would enhance both institutions by substantially integrating both institutions? Can fruitful inter-institutional cooperative programs of educational and facilites exchange be developed? Solutions to the problems generated by Adams v. Califano in these particular cases will require extraordinary sensitivity, skill and patience and are not likely to be resolved in a short period of time.

Many educators, both Black and white, make a compelling case for strengthening historically and predominantly Black institutions of higher education. They suggest that predominantly Black institutions (60-70 percent Black and 30-40 percent white) are essential for the educational, intellectual, and cultural experience and enrichment of both races. If true, would a truly equal-but-separate system at the post-secondary level be in fact the educational equality the Brown decision of 1954 compels? For some minority students, at least, it is not clear that a fully-integrated institution is educationally the most beneficial or productive environment. For these students immersion in an atmosphere

in which the Black experience is dominant is essential for their sustenance, strength and development. For reasons that are difficult to define, because they are not measurable, some students become more highly motivated and simply do better in a predominantly Black collegiate environment.

TABLE 4

FOURTEEN BLACK PUBLIC COLLEGES AND COMPETITORS

| Black College | White College |
|---|---|
| Alabama A & M University (1,880 blacks, 50 whites)* | University of Alabama at Hunstville (10 blacks, 958 whites) |
| Alabama State University (2,286 blacks, 3 whites) | Auburn University (new branch) (4 blacks, 271 whites) |
| Florida A & M University (3,841 blacks, 58 whites) | Florida State University (269 blacks, 12,040 whites) |
| Albany State College (1,834 blacks, 10 whites) | Albany Junior College (87 blacks, 885 whites) |
| Savannah State College (2,184 blacks, 20 whites) | Armstrong State College (37 blacks, 1,236 whites) |
| Grambling College (3,644 blacks, 29 whites) | Louisiana Tech University (392 blacks, 6,167 whites) |
| Southern University (11,753 students, fewer than 50 of them white) | Louisiana State University (1,147 blacks, 19,749 whites) |
| Morgan State College (3,674 blacks, 137 whites) | Towson State College (161 blacks, 5,335 whites) |
| Coppin State College (1,163 blacks, 50 whites) | University of Maryland/Baltimore City (153 blacks, 2,600 whites) |
| North Carolina A & T State Univ. (3,338 blacks, 14 whites) | University of North Carolina at Greensboro (146 blacks, 4,473 whites) |
| Tennessee State University (3,774 blacks, 11 whites) | University of Tennesee/Nashville (32 blacks, 433 whites) |
| Texas Southern University (3,568 blacks, 28 whites) | University of Houston (363 blacks, 12,253 whites) |
| Norfolk State College (4,075 blacks, 42 whites) | Old Dominion University (91 blacks, 5,413 whites) |
| Virginia State College (2,157 blacks, 30 whites) | Richard Bland Community College (5 blacks, 538 whites) |

* Full-time undergraduate enrollment by race shown in parentheses.

Source: Egerton, John. Black Public Colleges: Integration and Disintegration. A Report. Nashville, Tennessee: Race Relations Center, 1971.

## IV. POLICY ISSUES

Perhaps the first issue to be addressed is whether or not there is a need in American higher education for the historically Black colleges and universities and the new predominantly Black colleges. The answer to this question is yes, and not merely because of the extraordinary role they have played in American society for a hundred years or more, but, more importantly, for their contribution to the fulfillment of national policy to provide access to higher education for all who can benefit from it. Because they perform this function so well, especially because of their ability to seek out and matriculate high school graduates who, for one reason or another, are educationally deprived, it is in the public interest and the national interest that they survive.

There is a question, however, of whether the Title III program is the most appropriate mechanism for providing federal assistance. Title III recognized the structural weaknesses of these institutions, not their strengths. Title III highlights these institutions as "welfare" recipients rather than rewarding these institutions for the contribution they make to the fulfillment of federal policy and national interest. Furthermore, Title III is an institutional aid program, of relatively tiny dimensions, struggling to survive within an agency and a national policy committed to the support of students. While there is considerable support for institutional aid within the community of Black educators and administrators, a program designed to help institutions as institutions, and not linked to the role the institution plays in providing for the education of low-income and minority populations, is not likely to be funded by Congress at levels sufficient to make them financially strong and independent. Elias Blake Jr.

argues strongly for financial support of institutions contributing to the achievement of national goals:

> There is a second disproportionate concept I would throw into this, that is the question of whether or not the service role, is a modal servicing role. Do you see what I am saying? If the institution as an institution in its modal role is carrying this disproportionate responsibility, Blacks, poor whites, Indians, Mexican-Americans, that institution begins to move up to the front of the line in terms of institutional support. The institutional support flows to an institution because of its institutional role.
>
> In other words, an institution is developing, in a disproportionate way, so that one shifts the whole developing concept to the relationship between an institution and the development of these national goals.
>
> One focuses on an institution that has a disproportionate share of responsibility for achieving these goals. The second definition I talked about to review as one looks at the institution, one looks at what I call a modal expression of what the institution does, not what is involved in helping, but what is the modal activity of the institution; is it related to helping achieve this national goal in a disproportionate way?

The student aid strategy is now and probably will remain the dominant federal policy for the support of higher education in the United States. Significant financial assistance for the historically Black colleges will probably only come about when such assistance is linked to the students they matriculate and graduate, and to the services they provide these students. Considerably more money can be channeled into these institutions by linking the money to student aid policies than by any other means. Increased funds, in continuing and dependable amounts, are more likely to make these institutions competitive in the educational marketplace. Hence, their survival will depend on their ability to compete with other institutions for students rather than on the vagaries of congressional support for an insignificant program of institutional aid. The question of whether federal assistance should flow to public as well as private colleges can be ignored if the student,

and the services provided to the student, are central to the decision to provide federal assistance.

The preeminent question of integration versus segregation cannot as lightly be dismissed. While it is no longer legal or possible to maintain segregated institutions or institutions with only token minority enrollments, there are benefits derived for the student as well as society in having predominantly minority institutions of higher education.

As presently constituted, Title III is a welfare program and the federal government is looked to to ensure the survival of a group of "financially struggling institutions outside the mainstream of American higher education." A program which maintains this dependency relationship is of very doubtful long-term benefit to the institution or the nation. A program which recognizes the contribution these colleges make to students will permit these colleges to compete; hence, it will be the educational market that determines their survival rather than the federal government.

## V. POLICY ALTERNATIVES

The next year or two will be critical for Title III. During the past year it has undergone the most intensive review in its history. It will come under additional scrutiny during the hearings for the reauthorization of the Higher Education Act to be held in 1979 and 1980. In addition, the first grants made under the new regulations will be awarded in the forthcoming year.

Within the higher education community in Washington there is general agreement to try to increase the authorization for this Title from $120 million to $200 million. Within the Congress Title III, as a consequence of the publication of the new regulations, is being looked at with greater favor than it has in the past. Within the Executive Branch, (the authors of the new regulations,) there is a sense of greater support for the program. The widely publicized meeting of the presidents of the historically Black colleges and President Carter, followed as it was by a directive to all government departments and agencies to take into account their contributions to the traditionally Black colleges has increased the expectations of the college presidents for the future of the Title III program and federal support in general.

In developing programs of support for institutions of which the historically Black colleges are primary examples, five strategies should be considered:

1. Continue to Present the Title III Program

Since the new regulations need some time to prove themselves more effective and efficient in distinguishing eligible colleges and universities, it might be best to give the program an opportunity to demonstrate whether or not this hope can be fulfilled. Some minor administrative adjustments might be appropriate in smoothing out the timing of the awards to make

them dove-tail more closely with the academic year. It would help university budget officers enormously to be certain that award notices will be made in sufficient time to be included in the budget making process.

Only time will tell whether or not the complicated system of ratings by review panels and by the Commissioner's office will result in a reduction of the suspicion of arbitrariness in award process.

It would be a great benefit that the National Advisory Committee on Black Higher Education and Black Colleges and Universities be provided with a permanent and expert staff. It is the primary monitoring agent for the Black educational community. Presently it lacks the staff and budget to undertake the kind of analytic role which would make its efforts more effective. Consideration might be given to making the committee permanent since it is concerned not only with the traditionally Black colleges but higher education for Blacks in general. It might, for example, be charged with the developing plans and processes, perhaps within the framework of Title III, for increasing the participation of Black and other minorities in graduate and professional schools.

The replacement of old and outmoded equipment essential to the maintenance of standards of many course offerings is a critical problem in many of the Title III institutions. Presently the expenditure of funds from Title III grants for equipment is restricted. If this constraint were lifted, major steps in improving the capacity of these institutions would follow.

2. Make Explicit the Intent of Title III to Support Traditionally Black Colleges and Newer Predominantly Black Colleges.

Congress has seen fit to ear-mark 24 percent of the appropriations for Title III for community and junior colleges. Until recently an additional 1.4 percent were ear-marked for Indian-controlled community colleges.

Would it be constitutional to "set aside" in a like manner a specific portion of the appropriated funds for two groups of Black educational institutions? In the Public Works Employment Act, Congress has mandated that 10 percent of the expenditures contracted for be set-aside for minority contractors. Is it possible to use this as a precedent and, by analogy, earmark between 50 and 60 percent of Title III appropriations for the Black institutions? Presently the historically Black institutions receive about 50 percent of the funds awarded under Title III. Is this a reasonable share, and how is reasonable to be defined and determined?

3. Eliminate the Set-Aside for Community and Junior Colleges.

Obviously, if the community and junior colleges were eliminated from the institutions eligible for Title III funds there would be more money available for distribution among eligible four-year institutions. Theoretically, it might be argued that support of community and junior colleges could be more appropriately channelled through Title X of the Higher Education Amendments of 1972. However, because Title X was originally an institutional aid program, although it no longer is so, it has never been funded. It is therefore extremely doubtful and unlikely that an attempt to eliminate the community and junior colleges as institutions eligible for Title III funds would be successful. The community and junior colleges are influential in Congress and are especially adept at protecting their interests and their participation in programs once that participation has been established.

4. Add an Endowment Component to Title III

Dr. F. D. Patterson of the Robert Moton Memorial Institute, formerly President of Tuskegee Institute, has widely promoted a plan to build the endowments of the historically Black colleges and universities. Dr.

Patterson was one of the founders of the United Negro College Fund, and is therefore widely regarded among those who are concerned with this subject. His proposal, The College Endowment Funding Plan, was published in 1976. Briefly, the plan requires three sources of funds and an astute investment policy. The Patterson Plan suggests that the institution generate about $1 million through gifts, alumni drives, and any other source. The proposal requires that about $3 million be borrowed from one or more private lenders and that $500 thousand be acquired from the federal government in the form of a grant. The $1 million of institutionally generated funds act as a good faith fund. In the original plan the $3 million loan from one or more private lenders is to be backed by a government guarantee. The federal grant of $500 thousand is earmarked to defray interest payments on the loan. By investing the $4.5 million wisely, and by deferring repayment of principal for 15 years, an unencumbered endowment of $5 million can be expected to be generated, always providing that inflation and an unpredictable market do not interfere with this plan.

There are a number of risks associated with this plan. The Ford Foundation is presently sponsoring an analysis of the plan and an evaluation of the attendant risks. Would public policy be served if Title III funds were permitted to be used as a federal share required by the plan?

5. Minority and Low-Income Student-Based Collegiate Opportunity (COG).

The new regulations governing Title III recognize the role played by a distinct group of colleges and universities, Black and white, which provide educational opportunities for large numbers of low-income and minority students. The new regulations overwhelmingly favor those two

and four-year colleges whose primary mission and goal it is to perform this essential function. Those colleges and universities which perform this function are characteristically endowment-poor, financially weak and tuition-dependent. Institutions which are financially strong do not, in the main, consider this role among their primary goals.

If it is in the national interest to expand educational opportunity for those who have been educationally deprived, then it is in the national interest to assist those colleges which actively choose to perform this function and support national policy. Just as the new Title III regulations link eligibility and awards to low-income and minority students so too might a program which more explicitly recognizes and rewards this function. It is not difficult to conceive of a program which offers Collegiate Opportunity Grants of "$X" per student provided that the proportion of students attending a specific college and receiving the maximum applicable BEOG for that college is above a minimum percent. The staff have asked for data which would permit this idea to be tested and to determine the costs of such a program.

There are, of course, advantages and disadvantages to such a proposal. Title III is in place and not likely to be eliminated as long as a group of institutions depend on it. It is risky to believe that the beneficiaries of Title III would be willing to give up a known quantity for an unknown. A program not too dissimilar to the one suggested here was enacted, but never funded, in 1972 as Sub-Part 5 of Title IV of the Higher Education Amendments. This program entitled, Assistance to Institutions of Higher Education, provided for an extraordinarily complicated schedule of cost-of-education payments to be made to institutions enrolling one or more recipients

of any size BEOG award. Therefore any institution, notwithstanding the number of BEOG students involved, would receive cost-of-education payments. This program is simply too diffuse.

If as proposed in another working paper, the BEOG is made an entitlement then so too might the COG.

A program involving a COG might be used to replace Title III entirely, thus eliminating the extraordinary contortions, conceptual and regulatory, of trying to shape that program to fit national education policy. It is not difficult to imagine that COG awards could reasonably be different for public and private institutions, in order to induce state governments to bear their share of the burden. Much more analysis is required to determine the feasibility of this idea.

# APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### A. Legislative History and Evolution of the Title III Program

The political, social and moral climate in the United States in 1965 supported the explicit embrace of civil rights and civil liberties for Black Americans and Black institutions. The spirit of civil rights legislation was clearly manifest in the Higher Education Act of 1965. Title III of that act, the section dealing with "Developing Institutions," committed the federal government to the assistance of Black colleges and universities.

Although the intent of Congress was clear, to provide funds for the support of historically Black colleges and universities, the language of the act was deliberately vague in order to accommodate two constraints. First, it was unclear at the time that identifying and isolating "Black" colleges for direct federal financial support was constitutional or at least in keeping with the thrust and tone of civil rights legislation. Secondly, to make the beneficiaries explicitly "Black" colleges would have subjected the proposal to the vagaries of congressional political processes, notwithstanding the "moral climate" of the times.

Thus, Congresswoman Edith Green's proposal to stimulate the exchange of faculty between more academically established institutions and the historically Black colleges[1] evolved, in partnership with the executive branch, into a five-year program "to assist in raising the academic quality of colleges which have the desire and potential to make a substantial contribution to the higher education community, but which for financial and other reasons are struggling to survive and are isolated from the main currents of academic life."[2] While much of the discussion of Title III concerned a "more systematic exchange of faculty" and the provision of "aid to small colleges," Mrs.

Green stated that her proposal was intended "to provide a means of strengthening Black colleges in the south."

It is important to recall the background of the period in which Title III originated. First, 51% of Blacks in higher education were enrolled in the 123 historically Black colleges existing at that time. Secondly, in 1965 the idea of federal support of colleges and universities by means of institutional grants-in-aid was very much in the air. (Mrs. Green was an advocate of institutional aid when the issue was joined during the debates of 1970 and 1971 leading to the student financial aid strategy embodied in the Higher Education Amendments of 1972.) Finally, and probably most important, the historically Black colleges, notwithstanding their extreme financial weakness, their almost totally inadequate facilities and equipment and their narrow curricular offerings, were, especially in the South, almost the only higher education resources available to the Black population. That they were "not in the mainstream of academic life" was true; that they survived is extraordinary.[3]

Legislative Evolution and Funding History

From the outset a series of problems plagued Title III. The most important remain unresolved. Foremost among these is the fact that although "Title III is and has traditionally been aimed at supporting Black institutions in particular, this has never been stated in appropriate legislation since it would probably violate the Civil Rights Act." Consequently, the euphemism "developing institutions" remains impossible to define. There is an Alice-in-Wonderland quality about the attempts to define "developing" administratively and by regulation.[4] The same problem faced those trying to make more explicit phrase "mainstream of American higher Education"; no one is

quite certain where it is at any one time. Indeed, the "mainstream" probably consists of a number of interrelated, independent "streams" which make up the whole.

In 1965 the vagueness of the definition of "developing" bothered the legislature, the executive branch, and the representatives of the many institutions of higher education. At that time Congressman Griffin said that "it is pretty much a matter of discretion with the Commissioner [of OE] with very little in the way of anything objective or concrete except the fact that they [developing institutions] have to award degrees, be accredited or be making progress, and are seriously handicapped in efforts to improve such staff and service by lack of financial resources." Congresswoman Green replied, "It seems to me that any college could qualify." She went on to ask for, but failed to receive, "language which would tighten up this section so that we would more narrowly define the college that we really intend to help under Title III." Griffin displayed remarkable optimism: "Of course if a program with such wide discretionary latitude is administered properly, I suppose it can work very well. It would seem to me that we in Congress have quite a serious continuing responsibility; however, if we are not going to try to lay down policy a little more definite than this we must look over their shoulder and see what is going on, otherwise I do not think we would be fulfilling our responsibility."

The executives and educators were no less confused. Francis Keppel, then U.S. Commissioner of Education, and Broadus Butler, then his special assistant (later Dean of Texas Southern University and subsequently President of Dillard University), testified on this issue. Their remarks are summarized below.[5]

Table 5

Characteristics of Developing Institutions

| Described by Francis Keppel | Described by Broadus Butler |
|---|---|
| 1) Has limited financial support and small endowment. | 1) Has inability to compete for highly qualified personnel. |
| 2) Has relatively high dropout and transfer rates. | 2) Has excessive teaching loads militating against research and other activities for continued personal development. |
| 3) Has a slim catalogue of offerings. | 3) Has inability to maintain quality and continuity because of high personnel mobility and loss of contact by faculty with advances in their fields. |
| 4) Has difficulty attracting and retaining high quality faculty members. | 4) Has lack of development office and services to bring information and guidance to the administration. |

A major feature of the original Act was the emphasis placed on bilateral or consortium arrangements for cooperative activities among and between "developing institutions" and large, developed universities. Such cooperative arrangements became and remain a condition of an award of a Title III grant. There was virtually unanimous agreement that such arrangements would benefit both parties and that the flow of information and people was to be reciprocal rather than uni-directional, from the larger, more sophisticated institution to the smaller.

The inclusion of community and junior colleges as "developing institutions" was another issue of considerable controversy. Among the advocates for their inclusion were Homer Babbidge representing ACE, the Association of American Colleges and the American Association of Junior Colleges. Cobb suggests that it was the private sector of the community and junior colleges which fought most strongly for inclusion. The administration opposed the

participation of junior colleges arguing that the four-year colleges were most in need of financial support, that the junior colleges would disperse the probable available funds too widely and that the more critical problem facing the nation was to improve the capacity of small four-year colleges to receive students and provide them with a high-quality undergraduate education. The administration's arguments prevailed in the House but failed in the Senate. In conference, the House receded from its position and the junior colleges became part of the universe of developing institutions. In order to prevent the community and junior colleges from swallowing the whole of whatever funds were appropriated, the Congress, initially limited the proportion available to these institutions to 22%. The figure was determined by the proportion of all undergraduates enrolled in junior and community colleges -- not the proportion of Black students enrolled in community and junior colleges. This "set-aside" was perhaps the beginning of the erosion of the primary but implicit purpose of Title III.

An Advisory Council on Developing Institutions was mandated by Congress as part of Title III. Its purposes were to advise the Commissioner on policy matters and more specifically to help to identify the "developing institutions" which, with the help of federal funds, would help to achieve the purposes of Title III. The Council's goal was to establish priorities for the awarding of grants and to help determine the kinds of cooperation agreements which would be supported. It was hoped that the Advisory Council would neutralize the criticism of the vagueness in the definition of a "developing institution."

The legislation placed great emphasis on National Teaching Fellowships, a program designed to encourage highly-qualified graduate students and junior faculty of stronger institutions to teach at developing institutions. It was

thought that this provision would nurture the exchange of junior faculty members and draw upon the same kind of enthusiasm as was demonstrated by Peace Corps volunteers.

The original legislation called for the use of Title III funds "to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements...between developing institutions, between developing institutions and organizations, agencies, and business entities..." for the purpose of:

1. Faculty and student exchange as well as enabling visiting scholars to be on campus.
2. Faculty and administration improvement programs including fellowships leading to advanced degrees.
3. Introduction of new curriculums and curricular materials.
4. Development and operation of cooperative educational programs.
5. Joint use of facilities such as libraries, laboratories and equipment.
6. Other arrangements which promise to strengthen the academic programs and the administration of developing institutions.

The OE has strictly constructed the phrase "grants to institutions to pay part of the cost of planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements..." These cooperative arrangements are at the heart of the program. In response to this, a number of business enterprises have been established to stimulate and organize bilateral arrangements and consortia and assist the "developing institution" in "planning, developing, and carrying out cooperative arrangements." These enterprises are known as "assisting agencies" and their influence in the program is pervasive.

During the past thirteen years there have been only minor legislative changes in Title III although the regulations governing the administration of this Title have undergone considerable discussion. The newest regulations were issued on November 2, 1978 and hearings on these new regulations are being held across the country.

Between 1965 and 1976 the legislation was amended four times. In 1968 the "set-aside" for two-year colleges was raised from 22% to 23% and the Professor Emeritus program was added. In 1972 the "set-aside" for the two-year colleges was raised from 23% to 24%. In addition, accreditation or reasonable progress towards accreditation was made mandatory for a recipient institution. Also, a new class of eligible institutions was added: two- or four-year colleges "created on or near an Indian reservation or a substantial population of Indians, if such action will increase higher education of Indians." Funds for such institutions were earmarked as well and by law could not exceed 1.4% of the appropriation for this Title. Finally, the U.S. Commissioner of Education was given authority to waive the required matching share of the costs as a requirement of participation in several other federal programs supporting higher education. In 1974, the Commissioner was authorized to waive three years of the accreditation requirement if the applicant could show that a Title III grant would increase higher education opportunities for Spanish-speaking people. In 1976 the limit of 1.4% of appropriations for institutions serving a predominantly Indian population was removed so the newly-established Indian-controlled community colleges would have increased access to Title III funds.

The Title III regulations have undergone greater debate and changes. For a number of years the criteria for eligibility to participate in the Title III program were those written into the law itself. The awards were

based on the subjective and collective judgment of the Advisory Council and the U.S. Commissioner of Education. A "developing institution" was therefore a non-profit educational institution which:

1. Admits only persons with a high school diploma or its equivalent;
2. Is legally authorized to provide an educational program for which it awards a bachelor's degree or provides not less than a two-year program for credit toward such a degree;
3. Is accredited or is making reasonable progress toward such accreditation;
4. Has met the above requirements during the five academic years prior to the year in which it applies for assistance;
5. Is making an effort to improve the quality of its teaching, administrative and student services and faculty;
6. Is for financial or other reasons struggling for survival and is isolated from the main currents of academic life; and
7. Is not affiliated with a religious organization.

During hearings held in 1967 and 1968 in advance of reauthorization legislation, Harold Howe, then U.S. Commissioner of Education, testified that only through "subjective analysis and judgment" could his office determine if an institution were "making an effort to improve the quality of its teaching, administrative and student services" and whether an institution "for financial or other reasons [was] struggling...and...isolated from the main currents..."

At the time, a set of "emerging criteria for determining eligibility as a developing institution" was generated from the characteristics of those institutions already selected for an award. The characteristics of the award-winning two and four-year institutions at that time are described in Table 6.

TABLE 6

CHARACTERISTICS OF FUNDED DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS 1967[1]

| | | Mean Average | Moving Toward the "Acceptable Level" of |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Enrollment | 1,089 | 1,500 |
| 2. | Endowment income or annual state appropriation | $125,000 | $900,000 |
| 3. | Tuition | $556 | $1,500 |
| 4. | Educational and general expenditures | $1,141,000 | $2,107,400 |
| 5. | Educational and general expenditures per student | $1,048 | $1,740 |
| 6. | Faculty (size) | 66 | 98 |
| 7. | Percent of faculty holding doctorate | 26% | 52% |
| 8. | Student/faculty ratio | 20 | 12 |
| 9. | Library volumes | 51,000 | 157,000 |

1. U.S. Congress, House Committee on Education and Labor, Higher Education Amendments of 1967, Hearings, Special Subcommittee on Education, 90th Congress, first session, 1967.

Consequently, the following "emerging criteria" were derived:

1. Extreme financial limitations such as salaries of less than $6,000, unrestricted endowment less than $3 million, percentage cost of instruction per student less than 45 percent and expenditures for library less than 5 percent.
2. High faculty/student ratio.
3. Limited library holdings (one-third of the generally accepted minimum requirements).
4. Low percentage (less than one-third) of the faculty holding Ph.D. degrees.
5. High percentage of students (two-thirds) on scholarships and grants-in-aid.
6. Poor physical facilities -- lack of funds for upkeep and maintenance.
7. Poorly prepared students.
8. Cultural, social, professional, and academic isolation.
9. Little or no foundation, alumni, or corporate support.
10. Little or no sponsored research. No faculty publications.
11. Program offerings and counseling services out of step with new opportunities in careers and vocational occupations.
12. Degree of concern for the development of remedial or corrective programs.

13. Dearth of faculty with scholarly backgrounds and achievements accompanied by inability to attract highly accomplished faculty due to poor institutional incentive.
14. Inadequate development offices and limited capacity for long-range planning.

Howe hoped that "at the end of a three-year period the program shall have matured sufficiently to have developed more objective guidelines for the appraisal of basic institutional strength within the universe of developing institutions."

Indeed, under the direction of Willa Player, the Division of College Support did publish Criteria for Identifying a Developing Institution in 1971. In it were presented "Quantitative Measures of Institutional Eligibility." (See Table 7) The measures in this case were developed by contrasting an arbitrary minimum standard with the characteristics of the funded institutions and with criteria established by organizations such as regional accrediting associations, the AAUP, the American Library Association and others. These measures were never formally adopted but they did serve as unofficial guidelines within the Office of Education and suggested the direction in which that agency was heading to develop quantitative criteria for determining use which institutions would be eligible for Title III grants.

In 1973 the Title III program underwent a structural change as a result of administrative action. The program was divided into two parts: the Basic Institutional Development Program (BIDP) and the Advanced Institutional Development Program (AIDP). The purpose of the BIDP was to reduce the gap between small weak colleges and the stronger institutions; it resembled very closely the original Title III program. The purpose of the AIDP was to identify those stronger developing institutions which "have the potential for accelerated institutional development to expedite the institution's progress towards achieving both operational and fiscal stability and participation in the mainstream of American higher education." It was hoped that a

TABLE 7

QUANTITATIVE MEASURES OF INSTITUTIONAL ELIGIBILITY (1971)

| Item | TWO YEAR PRIVATE Minimum Eligibility Requirements | Developing | Developed | TWO YEAR PUBLIC Minimum Eligibility Requirements | Developing | Developed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FTE Student Enrollment | 200 | 680 | 2,000 | 200 | 1,380 | 2,000 |
| Percent Doctorates | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Percent Masters | 40% | 70% | 90% | 40% | 72% | 90% |
| Average Professor's Salary | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Average Instructor's Salary | $7,250 | $6,410 | $15,000 | $8,000 | $7,825 | $20,000 |
| Total Current Income | $145,000 | $939,110 | $3,712,000 | $145,000 | $1,379,000 | $5,311,000 |
| FTE/Student Expenditures | $675 | $1,600 | $2,268 | $675 | $1,190 | $2,068 |
| Total Volumes in Library | 17,000 | 16,270 | 30,000 | 17,000 | 21,200 | 30,000 |

| Item | FOUR YEAR PRIVATE Minimum Eligibility Requirements | Developing | Developed | FOUR YEAR PUBLIC Minimum Eligibility Requirements | Developing | Developed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| FTE Student Enrollment | 200 | 970 | 1,000 | 200 | 2,270 | 5,000 |
| Percent Doctorates | 30% | 24% | 70% | 30% | 23% | 65% |
| Percent Masters | 50% | 63% | 25% | 50% | 67% | 24% |
| Average Professor's Salary | $7,970 | $10,930 | $22,680 | $9,260 | $12,000 | $28,400 |
| Average Instructor's Salary | $5,180 | $6,520 | $8,760 | $5,340 | $7,000 | $9,500 |
| Total Current Income | $270,000 | $2,154,000 | $5,941,268 | $270,000 | $3,707,800 | $11,825,300 |
| FTE/Student Expenditures | $850 | $2,240 | $2,800 | $850 | $1,790 | $2,300 |
| Total Volumes in Library | 50,000 | 56,870 | 300,000 | 50,000 | 74,850 | 300,000 |

Source: Player, W., Criteria for Identifying Developing Institutions.

substantial grant, usually for five years, would create a "developed" institution; one which would move out of the Title III program.

Program priorities for AIDP included the introduction of professional and career programs in fields previously denied to graduates of the institution; newer teaching strategies and curriculum developments; and, a proven capacity to develop operational and fiscal stability. Grants to AIDP institutions were larger than those to institutions in the BID Program.

Parenthetically it should be noted that the scope, shape, purposes, format and procedures regulating the AIDP program are extraordinarily similar to the program of support of a selected few Black colleges and universities sponsored by the Ford Foundation. In 1972 the Foundation chose 9 historically Black colleges for six-year awards and another 12 similar colleges for one-year consolation prizes. The total amount granted was $50,000,000 of which $48 millions, more or less, went to the 9 institutions which received multi-year awards. The program emphasized long-range planning, improving academic strength, financial stability and increasing the size of the student body.[6] Dr. Morris T. Keeton, formerly of Antioch and Oberlin is presently engaged in broad, critical review of the results of the Ford Foundation efforts on these colleges.

In response to increasing pressure from the colleges as well as from Congress, a notice of proposed rulemaking for Title III was published in November 1974. This was in part a response to the review of the program then underway by the Comptroller General's Office.

Between 1972 and 1974 the General Accounting Office conducted an assessment of the Title III program. Their report to the Congress was published in 1975. In it the GAO said that it "was unable to assess the program's success nationwide because the Office [OE] has not defined a

developing institution specifically nor determined when an institution would be considered developed."[7] The Comptroller General's office was able to perform sophisticated analyses to determine the characteristics having a statistically significant impact on the determination of eligibility and funding. The results of this analysis are summarized in Table 8 below. The report concludes that "those institutional characteristics which statistically appeared to have influenced such decisions were not, for the most part, among the eligibility factors that OE subsequently established."[8] They further conclude that "based on the results of our statistical analysis of eligibility determinations for the school year 1973-74, OE apparently either did not consistently apply the criteria it said it was using or used other criteria. If OE used other criteria, the criteria established in May 1974 may not appropriately identify developing institutions. In any event, no certainty exists that eligibility determinations, if continued as in the past, will help those institutions intended by legislation."[9]

The first formal regulations were published in June of 1975 in the Federal Register. Eight quantitative factors and three qualitative ones were described. The quantitative factors (Table 9 below) permit inter-institutional comparisons so that institutions compete with those similar to them. The qualitative factors, enrollments, institutional personnel and institutional vitality, are admittedly more judgmental than objective. The reservations of the Comptroller General's Office still obtain.

TABLE 8

CHARACTERISTICS HAVING A STATISTICALLY SIGNIFICANT IMPACT ON ELIGIBILITY AND FUNDING* (1973-74)

## Grant Award Determinations

### 2-Year Institutions

Whether or not the institution was funded in the previous school year, 1972-73; specifically, institutions funded in 1972-73 were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

The racial composition of the institution's student body; specifically, predominantly Black institutions were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

### 4-Year Institutions

Whether or not the institution was funded in the previous year; specifically, institutions funded in 1972-73 were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

The portion of the student body from low-income families; specifically, institutions selected to participate tended to have higher percentages of students from low-income families than those not selected.

Whether the institution was public or private institution; specifically, private institutions were strongly associated with the group selected to participate in 1973-74.

## Fund Allocation Decisions

### 2-Year Institutions

The funding relationship between OE and the participating institutions receiving grants directly from OE (as opposed to participating in a cooperative arrangement) were strongly associated with larger allocations.

The racial composition of the institution's student body; predominantly Black institutions were strongly associated with larger fund allocations

Total education and general expenditures per full-time equivalent student' institutions which had higher total education and general expenditures per full-time equivalent student were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

### 4-Year Institutions

Racial composition of the institution's student body; predominantly Black institutions were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

The funding relationship between OE and the participating institution; institutions receiving grants directly from OE were strongly associated with larger fund allocations.

Number of students from low-income families; institutions with more students from low-income families tended to receive larger fund allocations.



* Listed in order of significance beginning with those having the greatest significance.

Source: Report to the Congress by the Comptroller General, pp. 9-10.

TABLE 9

TITLE III OF THE HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
PERCENTILES FOR FY '74 GRANTEES (AIDP AND BIDP) USING DATA FROM '74 APPLICATIONS

| | 5% | 25% | 50% | 75% | 95% |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Two-Year Public** | | | | | |
| FTE Enrollment | 395 | 766 | 1,217 | 2,304 | 4,122 |
| Full-Time Enrollment | 275 | 672 | 890 | 1,609 | 3,045 |
| Percent of Faculty w/ Masters | 40 | 70 | 79 | 83 | 91 |
| Average Faculty Salary | 7,800 | 8,822 | 10,113 | 11,041 | 14,800 |
| Percent of Students from Low-Income Families[1] | 14 | 33 | 47 | 63 | 86 |
| Total E & G Expendirues | 681,212 | 1,118,202 | 1,542,652 | 2,488,819 | 6,790,000 |
| E & G Expenditures/FTE | 621 | 1,068 | 1,341 | 1,680 | 2,300 |
| Volumes in Library | 10,750 | 20,913 | 27,505 | 34,179 | 47,000 |
| **Two-Year Private** | | | | | |
| FTE Enrollment | 147 | 205 | 419 | 592 | 1,204 |
| Full-Time Enrollment | 123 | 178 | 384 | 546 | 1,196 |
| Percent of Faculty w/Masters | 60 | 67 | 74 | 81 | 86 |
| Average Faculty Salary | 6,225 | 7,100 | 7,886 | 8,424 | 9,432 |
| Percent of Students from Low-Income Families[1] | 17 | 23 | 38 | 80 | 94 |
| Total E & G Expenditures | 315,562 | 379,777 | 672,865 | 990,788 | 1,407,697 |
| E & G Expenditures/FTE | 555 | 973 | 1,462 | 2,144 | 4,001 |
| Volumes in Library | 5,510 | 18,893 | 21,179 | 29,239 | 40,418 |
| **Four-Year Public** | | | | | |
| FTE Enrollment | 672 | 1,702 | 2,372 | 3,224 | 5,290 |
| Percent of Faculty w/ Ph.D | 20 | 28 | 32 | 38 | 95 |
| Average Salary/Professor | 11,460 | 14,040 | 15,467 | 16,315 | 17,888 |
| Average Salary/Instructor | 8,000 | 8,696 | 8,905 | 9,485 | 10,840 |
| Percent of Students from Low-Income Families[1] | 15 | 42 | 63 | 79 | 95 |
| Total E & G Expenditures | 988,633 | 2,916,696 | 3,917,770 | 5,395,140 | 10,280,000 |
| E & G Expenditures/FTE | 1,101 | 1,617 | 1,863 | 2,402 | 3,183 |
| Volumes in Library | 45,000 | 75,233 | 95,000 | 120,430 | 242,191 |

TABLE 9 - (cont.)

| | Four-Year Private | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5% | 25% | 50% | 75% | 95% |
| FTE Enrollment | 346 | 532 | 704 | 1,027 | 1,865 |
| Percent of Faculty w/Ph.D | 12 | 24 | 31 | 40 | 40 |
| Average Salary/Professor | 9,750 | 12,000 | 12,854 | 13,802 | 15,840 |
| Average Salary/Instructor | 6,883 | 7,650 | 8,330 | 8,871 | 9,470 |
| Percent of Students from Low-Income Families[1] | 10 | 24 | 44 | 77 | 94 |
| Total E & G Expenditures | 801,890 | 1,108,871 | 1,590,827 | 2,140,888 | 3,987,714 |
| E & G Expenditures/FTE | 1,040 | 1,820 | 2,186 | 2,590 | 3,746 |
| Volumes in Library | 27,500 | 48,000 | 57,530 | 69,000 | 96,768 |

1. For purposes of this subpart a low-income family is one whose adjusted family income is less than $7,500.

This was the first effort in the history of the Title III program to make explicit the eligibility and selection criteria. It was notable in that the regulations distinguished between quantitative and qualitative criteria and provided "an index to demonstrate to applicants their position vis-à-vis other developing institutions." These factors however may measure changes in the institution -- they do not necessarily measure quality. It is unclear that they could measure movement into the "mainstream" or movement out of the category of "struggling."

Within only a few years, by December of 1977, the regulations were under review again by analysts in the Office of Education. The new Commissioner of Education recognized these guidelines as "fuzzy" and, as part of HEW's Operation Common Sense, ordered a review. The Commissioner did not want to be saddled with defending funding decisions in a sensitive area in the context of unclear guidelines. Informally, OE staff coordinated with staff of cognizant Senate and House committees in order to avoid any gross inconsistencies with Congressional thinking.

As published in November 1978, the new regulations use only two criteria for determining the eligibility of a college or university for the Title III program. These are the average BEOG award for FTE undergraduate student and the average Educational and General expenditure of the institution per FTE student. Grants are awarded in each of these categories on a scale of 0-200 based on the institution's percentile ranking when compared to all other similar institutions. With regard to the awarding of points based on the average BEOG "an institution that is estimated to be in the 97th percentile (a large BEOG award per student) receives 194 points, while an institution estimated to be in the third percentile (a small BEOG award per student) receives 6 points."[10] Points are scored for E & G expenditures as well.

however, high average E & G expenditures per student generate few points while low average E & G expenditures create many points. To be considered as eligible an institution must score a combined total of at least 174 points, although the regulations permit an appeal by institutions scoring fewer than 175 points to "submit a written statement explaining why the indicators do not sufficiently reflect its status as a struggling institution and one isolated from the main currents of academic life." In addition the applicant institution must submit a statement describing "the steps it has taken over the past 3 years to insure its survival." If the institution has experienced a decline in enrollment of over 5% in the past three-year period, or if the total current fund revenues have declined in any of the past 3 years, or if there has been a net loss on the institution's balance sheet in any 2 of the past 3 years, it must explain these events and what has been done to overcome them.

These new criteria for eligibility are significant for a number of reasons. First, by emphasizing the BEOG, explicit recognition of the Title III institutions' mission to provide educational opportunities to students from low-income families is acknowledged. By emphasizing average E & G expenditures an attempt has been made to recognize those institutions which are "struggling" for survival. There are complications in this element of the criteria because a high average E & G expenditure may mask inefficiencies or reflect short-term funding from past Title III grants or foundation funds.

The new regulations reflect the reaction of the executive branch to irregularities at two "developing institutions" which had comingled funds; the desire of the Commissioner to make the Title III program something more than an institution-saving mechanism; the wish to be able to award funds to the "best" of the developing institutions -- those

with innovative programs and those which seem to have the best chance of surviving; and a conscious effort (successful or not) to favor the historically Black colleges and the newer predominantly Black colleges. They also separate the process of determining eligibility from the application process thereby saving both the government and the institution time and money. These new regulations, about which hearings are presently being held, merit review in some detail.

Added to the purpose of Title III, in addition to improving academic programs, administrative and management capability and student services, is the goal of improving an institution's fiscal stability. Although the phrase is unclear, it expresses the federal government's concern in this arena in a way which would neither antagonize nor damn the academic community. Among the "Funding Limitations" are provisions which recognize the decision in Adams v. Califano. Any action which "impedes the elimination of, or establishes segregated attendance patterns" is deemed inconsistent with the purposes of Title III. So too is any activity "such as curriculum development or faculty improvement" which is inconsistent with an approved State Plan for the elimination of dual systems of higher education. Among the new criteria for designation as a developing institution is one which says that "the institution must also be making a reasonable effort to meet its mission and accomplish its goals through activities carried out over the past 3 years..." Again, although the language is not absolutely precise, and admits of the potential for administrative manipulation, the intent is to identify and fund the stronger colleges and those which have made substantial efforts at improvement. In addition, another section requires proof that "the institution must be making a constructive effort to ensure that it will continue to survive."

The use of the average BEOG award and the average E & G expenditure per FTE student as criteria for eligibility serves several purposes. It attempts to make eligibility less arbitrary and more objective by introducing a scoring system linked to service to low-income students. In addition, according to OE staff, the Black colleges would fare well or better using these two criteria than others which had been considered. (It is too early to know if this is really the case. Analyses proving this assertion either way have not been made public or available.) BEOG was chosen because it is linked to access to higher education and because of all the financial aid programs it is the one which can be validated. The campus-based programs cannot be validated and are not as well correlated with incomes as is the BEOG program. The administrative problems attendant to considering the total student aid package are too overwhelming to be considered. The use of the average BEOG grant per student is an attempt to take into account the effect of passage of the Educational Opportunity Act (the Middle Income Student Assistance Bill) under which students from families with incomes of up to $25,000 per year are eligible for a modest BEOG award. Institutions with large numbers of students from middle-income families will tend to have small average BEOG awards per student.

The requirement that an institution, in order to be designated as "developing" must "possess the desire and potential to make a substantial and distinctive contribution to the higher education resources of the Nation" is an attempt to reduce the number of eligible institutions and to favor those which, for example, "provide access to a particular group of students who would not otherwise have access to an institution of higher education..." In the same subsection, the phrase "the institution must have taken concrete steps to improve its overall academic and

administrative capacity over the past 3 years..." is another of the agency's attempts to favor the stronger institutions; also, it is a response to the publicity and political embarrassment created during the past year when relatively modest irregularities were uncovered in two "developing institutions." The division of Title III into the Basic Institutional Development Program and the Advanced Institutional Program is eliminated and all applicants participate in a single program. The distinction was eliminated because under the old regulations it was difficult for applicants to distinguish for which program they were eligible. A number of institutions prepared two applications at the same time; an enormously time-consuming and costly effort. Furthermore, implicit in the AIDP was the hope that a major multi-year grant would lift the institution into the stage of being "developed." This assumption proved unrealistic. In addition, the fund-replacement provision of AIDP came under severe attack and tacitly, it was dropped. A major distinction between the two programs was therefore eliminated. The new regulations recognize reality more directly.

Provisions are made in these regulations to limit the size of the consortia. This is a much needed constraint since some of these arrangements have grown so large that it is difficult to conceive that they can be effective.

An absolutely essential innovation is the explicit description of the criteria to be used by the review panels which screen the applications for Title III grants. Not only are the criteria stated but the maximum points assigned to each criteria are determined in the regulations.

Finally, after the review panel submits their recommendations, comments and ratings of the application, the Commissioner subjects those

long-overdue effort to define objective standards by which to administer the program. By linking Title III so strongly to access by low-income and minority students, the program is much more in line with national educational policy. However, as long as Title III retains the undefinable terms such as "developing," "struggling" and "main currents of academic life," the program is likely to remain underfunded to achieve its implicit and explicit purposes and unreliable as a source of funds for those colleges and universities it was created to help.

B. Funding History and Some Program Characteristics

There follow a few tables which describe some of the salient financial characteristics fo the Title III programs and some of the program characteristics.

Since its inception over $800 million have been appropriated and dispersed to developing institutions through Title III. (see Table 10)

Tables 11 and 12 below describe the distribution of funds awarded for a single fiscal year, 1977, among two- and four-year colleges and among predominantly Black and predominantly white institutions for the Basic and Advanced Institutional Development Programs.

Tables 13 and 14 show, for the period 1966-77, trends in funding, fund requests, proposals submitted, number of grantee institutions, National Teaching Fellowships awarded, etc. for both the Basic and Advanced programs. Of interest is the fluctuation in proposals submitted, the increasing difference between funds available and funds requested, especially in the Advanced program, the decline in National Teaching Fellowships awarded, the growth and then relative decline of the funding for the Assisting Agencies and the broad geographic distribution of awards.

Table 15 suggests that while the proportion of funds received by minority institutions under Title III has remained relatively constant, the share received by the predominantly Black colleges is declining.

Table 16 indicates that over a 6-year period predominantly Black colleges received about 84% of funds distributed under Title III to minority colleges and universities.

Tables 17 and 18 from a relatively early study of Title III by Hodgkinson and Schenkel, are reproduced to show the range of activities supported by Title III. The measurement of "success" and "helpfulness" are too subjective to be used to characterize the program or program constituents.

TABLE 10

TITLE III - FUNDING EXPERIENCE

(amounts in $000)

| Year | Authorization | Appropriation | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1966 | $55,000 | $ 5,000 | |
| 1967 | 30,000 | 30,000 | |
| 1968 | 55,000 | 30,000 | |
| 1969 | 35,000 | 30,000 | |
| 1970 | 70,000 | 30,000 | |
| 1971 | 91,000 | 33,850 | |
| 1972 | 91,000 | 51,850 | |
| | | BIDP | AIDP |
| 1973 | 120,000 | 51,850 | 35,500 |
| 1974 | 120,000 | 51,992 | 48,000 |
| 1975 | 120,000 | 52,000 | 58,000 |
| 1976 | 120,000 | 52,000 | 58,000 |
| 1977 | 120,000 | 52,000 | 58,000 |
| 1978 | 120,000 | 52,000 | 68,000 |

## TABLE 11

### TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
### STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
### BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

### Awards by Type of Institution, Fiscal Year 1977

| | Number of Grantees | Percent of Grantees | Total Funds | Percent of Funds | Average Grant |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| All Grantee Institutions | 190 | 100% | $52,476,440 | 100% | $276,192 |
| Four-Year | 122 | 64.2 | $39,860,000 | 76.0 | $326,721 |
| Two-Year | 68 | 35.8 | $12,616,440 | 24.0 | $185,536 |
| Public Institutions | 87 | 45.8 | $23,405,900 | 44.6 | $269,033 |
| Four-Year | 34 | 17.9 | $13,005,000 | 24.8 | $382,500 |
| Two-Year | 53 | 27.9 | $10,400,900 | 19.8 | $196,243 |
| Private Institutions | 103 | 54.2 | $29,070,540 | 55.4 | $282,238 |
| Four-Year | 88 | 46.3 | $26,855,000 | 51.2 | $305,170 |
| Two-Year | 15 | 7.9 | $ 2,215,540 | 4.2 | $147,703 |
| Predominantly Black Institutions | 47 | 24.7 | $25,397,000 | 48.4 | $540,361 |
| Four-Year | 38 | 20.0 | $22,870,000 | 43.6 | $601,842 |
| Two-Year | 9 | 4.7 | $ 2,527,000 | 4.8 | $280,777 |
| Predominantly White Institutions | 143 | 75.3 | $27,079,440 | 51.6 | $189,366 |
| Four-Year | 84 | 44.2 | $16,990,000 | 32.4 | $202,261 |
| Two-Year | 59 | 31.1 | $10,089,440 | 19.2 | $171,007 |

TABLE 12

TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
ADVANCED INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Awards by Type of Institution, Fiscal Year 1977

| | Number of Grantees | Percent of Grantees | Total Funds | Percent of Funds | Average Grant |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Totals | 93 | 100% | $58,000,000 | 100% | $623,656 |
| Four-Year | 65 | 69.9 | $44,080,000 | 76.0 | $678,154 |
| Two-Year | 28 | 30.1 | $13,920,000 | 24.0 | $497,143 |
| Grantee Institutions | 89 | 95.7 | $56,432,500 | 97.3 | $634,073 |
| Four-Year | 63 | 67.7 | $43,163,000 | 74.4 | $685,127 |
| Two-Year | 26 | 28.0 | $13,269,500 | 22.9 | $510,365 |
| Consortia* | 4 | 4.3 | $ 1,567,500 | 2.7 | $391,875 |
| Four-Year | 2 | 2.15 | $ 917,000 | 1.6 | $458,500 |
| Two-Year | 2 | 2.15 | $ 650,500 | 1.1 | $325,250 |
| Public Institutions** | 41 | 44.1 | $33,180,900 | 57.2 | $809,290 |
| Four-Year | 20 | 21.5 | $21,193,500 | 36.5 | $1,059,675 |
| Two-Year | 21 | 22.6 | $11,987,400 | 20.7 | $570,829 |
| Private Institutions** | 48 | 51.6 | $23,251,600 | 40.1 | $484,408 |
| Four-Year | 43 | 46.2 | $21,969,500 | 37.9 | $510,919 |
| Two-Year | 5 | 5.4 | $ 1,282,100 | 2.2 | $256,420 |
| Predominantly Black Institutions** | 35 | 37.6 | $22,873,700 | 39.4 | $653,534 |
| Four-Year | 32 | 34.4 | $22,600,700 | 38.95 | $706,272 |
| Two-Year | 3 | 3.2 | $ 273,000 | 0.45 | $91,000 |
| Predominantly White Institutions** | 54 | 58.1 | $33,558,800 | 57.9 | $621,459 |
| Four-Year | 31 | 33.35 | $20,562,300 | 35.5 | $663,300 |
| Two-Year | 23 | 24.75 | $12,996,500 | 22.4 | $565,065 |

* Includes consortia for training development officers as well as technical assistance consortia.

** Does not include consortia grants.

## TABLE 13

## TITLE III, HIGHER EDUCATION ACT OF 1965
## STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
## BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

## COMPARATIVE DATA FOR FISCAL YEARS 1966 - 1977

| | 1966 | 1967 | 1968 | 1969 | 1970 | 1971 | 1972 | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976* | 1977 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Funds Appropriated & Obligated (in thousands) | $ 5,000 | $ 30,000 | $ 30,000 | $ 30,000 | $ 30,000 | $ 33,850 | $ 51,850 | $ 51,850 | $ 51,992 | $ 52,000 | $ 52,000 | $52,000* |
| Funds Requested by Institutions (in thousands) | $ 32,250 | $ 56,792 | $113,925 | $ 95,187 | $ 85,434 | $105,048 | $143,000 | $220,000 | $198,000 | $222,000 | $196,000 | $184,000 |
| Number of Proposals Submitted | 310 | 560 | 500 | 464 | 433 | 441 | 456 | 470 | 511 | 491 | 431 | 410 |
| Number of Grantee Developing Inst. | (127) | (411) | (220) | (229) | (227) | (198) | (226) | (235) | (215) | (207) | (203) | (190) |
| Other Non-Grantee Participating Inst. | (31) | (55) | (148) | (186) | (215) | (307) | (330) | (232) | (139) | (230) | (232) | (229) |
| Total Developing Inst. Benefiting from Title III Funds | 158 | 466 | 368 | 415 | 442 | 505 | 556 | 467 | 354 | 437 | 435 | 419 |
| Assisting Institutions | 66 | 168 | 131 | 142 | 156 | 151 | 185 | 181 | 162 | 141 | 163 | 168 |
| Assisting Agencies & Businesses | 9 | 53 | 28 | 47 | 51 | 53 | 101 | 134 | 178 | 118 | 166 | 149 |
| National Teaching Fellowships Approved | 263 | 1,514 | 727 | 655 | 649 | 541 | 635 | 354 | 524 | 461 | 362 | |
| Professors Emeriti Awarded | -- | -- | -- | -- | 56 | 64 | 73 | 45 | 59 | 48 | 38 | |
| Geographical Representation of Grantees | 38 States & D.C. | 47 States Guam P.Rico D.C. | 45 States Guam P.Rico V. Isl. | 45 States Guam P.Rico V. Isl. | 44 States Guam P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 40 States P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 43 States P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 43 States P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 47 States P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 44 States P. Rico V. Isl. D.C. | 44 States P.Rico V. Isl. D.C. Am. Samoa | 46 States P.Rico V. Isl. Am. Samoa |

*An additional $476,440 was received from OE reprogrammed money to make the new total obligated funds--- $52,476,440.



66

67

TABLE 14

Advanced Institutional Development Program
Title III, Higher Education Act of 1965
Summary of Fiscal Years 1973-1976

| | 1973 | 1974 | 1975 | 1976 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Funds Appropriated & Obligated | $35,500,000 | $48,000,000 | $58,000,000 | $58,000,000 | $199,500,000 |
| Funds Requested by Institutions | $336,554,162 | $400,387,759 | $318,997,848 | $314,577,547 | $1,370,517,316 |
| Number of Proposals Submitted | 156 | 205 | 174 | 134 | 669 |
| Number of Institutions Funded | 28 | 36 | 61 | 34 | 159 |
| Number of Different Institutions Funded Since 1973 | 28 | 36 | 19 | 32 | 115 |
| Number of Grants Awarded | 28 | 36 | 63 | 34 | 161 |
| Geographical Representation of Grantees (States) | 22 | 18 | 26 | 23 | 36 |
| Number of Different Four-Year Colleges Funded | 17 | 23 | 44 | 22 | 75 |

Source: Program files.

TABLE 15

TITLE III, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS
BASIC INSTITUTIONAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Percent of Funds to Minorities of Total Appropriation
Fiscal Years 1966-1976

| Fiscal Year | Predominantly Black Colleges | Spanish-Speaking Programs | Native American Programs | Other | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1966 | 61 | 3 | --- | 36 | 100 |
| 1967 | 40 | 2 | 1 | 57 | 100 |
| 1968 | 47 | 3 | 1 | 49 | 100 |
| 1969 | 53 | 3 | 1 | 43 | 100 |
| 1970 | 57 | 2 | 1 | 40 | 100 |
| 1971 | 59 | 5 | 3 | 33 | 100 |
| 1972 | 60 | 5 | 4 | 31 | 100 |
| 1973 | 59 | 7 | 6 | 28 | 100 |
| 1974 | 57 | 7 | 7 | 29 | 100 |
| 1975 | 52 | 8 | 7 | 33 | 100 |
| 1976 | 49 | 10 | 8 | 33 | 100 |

Source: Annual Report on Title III, Strengthening Developing Institutions by the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. March 1977.

TABLE 16

TITLE III, STRENGTHENING DEVELOPING INSTITUTIONS

Number of Grants and Amounts Awarded to Minorities
Fiscal Years 1971-1976

| | Number of Grants | Amount Funded |
|---|---|---|
| **Predominantly Black Institutions** | | |
| 1971 Basic Program | 89 | $ 19,841,925 |
| 1972 Basic Program | 96 | 30,994,100 |
| 1973 Basic Program | 98 | 30,658,320 |
| 1973 Advanced Program | 13 | 23,380,000 |
| 1974 Basic Program | 67 | 29,620,000 |
| 1974 Advanced Program | 18 | 29,075,000 |
| 1975 Basic Program | 65 | 26,815,000 |
| 1975 Advanced Program | 29 | 29,228,000 |
| 1976 Basic Program | 55 | 25,450,000 |
| 1976 Advanced Program | 13 | 29,130,000 |
| TOTALS | 543 | 264,192,345 |
| **Programs for Spanish-Speaking** | | |
| 1971 Basic Program | 14 | 1,613,000 |
| 1972 Basic Program | 18 | 2,816,000 |
| 1973 Basic Program | 23 | 3,556,000 |
| 1973 Advanced Program | 3 | 2,220,000 |
| 1974 Basic Program | 26 | 3,812,000 |
| 1974 Advanced Program | 3 | 3,620,000 |
| 1975 Basic Program | 24 | 4,336,000 |
| 1975 Advanced Program | 10 | 3,609,777 |
| 1976 Basic Program | 31 | 4,660,825 |
| 1976 Advanced Program | 1 | 1,200,000 |
| TOTALS | 153 | 31,443,602 |
| **Programs for Native Americans** | | |
| 1971 Basic Program | 8 | 943,000 |
| 1972 Basic Program | 15 | 1,970,000 |
| 1973 Basic Program | 19 | 3,166,000 |
| 1973 Advanced Program | 2 | 791,375 |
| 1974 Basic Program | 28 | 3,517,000 |
| 1974 Advanced Program | -- | --- |
| 1975 Basic Program | 26 | 3,606,216 |
| 1975 Advanced Program | 2 | 247,500 |
| 1976 Basic Program | 27 | 4,231,100 |
| 1976 Advanced Program | 1 | 161,000 |
| TOTALS | 128 | 18,606,191 |

Source: Annual Report on Title III, Strengthening Developing Institutions by the Advisory Council on Developing Institutions. March 1977.

TABLE 17

MOST SUCCESSFUL PROGRAMS, ALL INSTITUTIONS,
BY SPECIFIC PROGRAM

| | *Total Grants Awarded, % of 3398* | *Most Successful Programs, % of 3398* | *Least Successful Programs, % of 3398* |
|---|---|---|---|
| CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| Basic Curriculum | 495 (14.6%) | 156 (4.6%) | 49 (1.4%) |
| Remedial Curriculum | 65 (1.9%) | 49 (1.4%) | 12 (0.4%) |
| Occupational Curriculum | 82 (2.4%) | 31 (0.9%) | 18 (0.5%) |
| Other | 206 (6.1%) | 35 (1.0%) | 7 (0.2%) |
| Total | 848 (25.0%) | 271 (7.9%) | 86 (2.5%) |
| FACULTY DEVELOPMENT | | | |
| National Teaching Fellows | 640 (18.8%) | 114 (3.4%) | 9 (0.3%) |
| Professors Emeriti | 42 (1.2%) | 9 (0.3%) | 7 (0.2%) |
| In-service Training | 269 (7.9%) | 56 (1.6%) | 34 (1.0%) |
| Advanced Graduate Training | 351 (10.3%) | 90 (2.6%) | 8 (0.3%) |
| Other | 199 (5.9%) | 30 (0.9%) | 29 (0.9%) |
| Total | 1501 (44.1%) | 299 (8.8%) | 87 (2.7%) |
| ADMINISTRATIVE IMPROVEMENT | | | |
| In-service Training | 124 (3.6%) | 48 (1.4%) | 19 (0.6%) |
| Advanced Graduate Training | 38 (1.1%) | 13 (0.4%) | 4 (0.1%) |
| Use of Outside Consultants | 147 (4.3%) | 67 (2.0%) | 25 (0.7%) |
| Establishment of New Offices | 175 (5.2%) | 42 (1.2%) | 6 (0.2%) |
| Other | 115 (3.4%) | 22 (0.6%) | 16 (0.5%) |
| Total | 599 (17.6%) | 192 (5.6%) | 70 (2.1%) |
| STUDENT SERVICES | | | |
| Counselling and Guidance | 193 (5.7%) | 73 (2.1%) | 14 (0.4%) |
| Remedial and Tutorial | 43 (1.3%) | 27 (0.8%) | 9 (0.3%) |
| Health Services | 1 (0.03%) | 3 (0.08%) | 0 (0.0%) |
| Other | 213 (6.3%) | 43 (1.3%) | 12 (0.4%) |
| Total | 450 (13.3%) | 146 (4.3%) | 35 (1.1%) |

TABLE 18

PARTICIPATING INSTITUTIONS - SUMMARY OF PROGRAM EVALUATION

| | *Funds Most Helpful* | *Fairly Helpful* | *Not Helpful* | *No Program in this Area* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I. Curriculum Development | | | | |
| A. Basic Curriculum | 76 | 19 | 2 | 36 |
| B. Remedial Curriculum | 21 | 11 | 1 | 82 |
| C. Vocational Curriculum | 11 | 14 | 3 | 86 |
| D. Other CUrriculum | 35 | 13 | 2 | 54 |
| | 143 | 57 | 8 | 258 |
| II. Faculty Development | | | | |
| A. National Teaching Fellows | 92 | 8 | 1 | 35 |
| B. Professors Emeriti | 9 | 4 | 1 | 106 |
| C. In-service Training | 58 | 21 | 3 | 46 |
| D. Advanced Graduate Training | 62 | 14 | 0 | 52 |
| E. Other Faculty Development | 25 | 9 | 2 | 72 |
| | 246 | 56 | 7 | 311 |
| III. Administrative Improvement | | | | |
| A. In-service Training | 40 | 25 | 3 | 64 |
| B. Advanced Graduate Training | 14 | 11 | 1 | 90 |
| C. Outside Consultants | 57 | 28 | 7 | 44 |
| D. New Offices Established | 41 | 5 | 2 | 77 |
| E. Other Administration | 15 | 8 | 0 | 80 |
| | 167 | 77 | 13 | 355 |
| IV. Student Services | | | | |
| A. Counseling and Guidance | 45 | 15 | 0 | 59 |
| B. Remedial and/or Tutorial | 14 | 9 | 1 | 86 |
| C. Health Services | 2 | 2 | 2 | 97 |
| D. Other Student Services | 20 | 4 | 3 | 40 |
| | 81 | 30 | 6 | 282 |

# APPENDIX B

## LISTING A

## HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES (HBC'S)*
(which are still predominantly Black)

| NAME | CITY/STATE | LEVEL/HIGHEST OFFERING[1] | CONTROL |
|---|---|---|---|
| Alabama A&M University | Normal, Alabama | ~~M+~~ | Public |
| Alabama Lutheran Academy & College | Selma, Alabama | 2 | Private |
| Alabama State University | Montgomery, Alabama | ~~M+~~ | Public |
| Albany State College | Albany, Georgia | B | Public |
| Alcorn State University | Lorman, Mississippi | M | Public |
| Allen University | Columbia, South Carolina | B | Private |
| Arkansas Baptist College | Little Rock, Arkansas | B | Private |
| Atlanta University | Atlanta, Georgia | D | Private |
| Barber Scotia College | Concord, North Carolina | B | Private |
| Benedict College | Columbia, South Carolina | B | Private |
| Bennett College | Greensboro, North Carolina | B | Private |
| Bethune Cookman College | Daytona Beach, Florida | B | Private |
| Bishop College | Dallas, Texas | B | Private |
| Bowie State College | Bowie, Maryland | M | Public |
| Central State University | Wilberforce, Ohio | B | Public |
| Cheyney State College | Cheyney, Pennsylvania | M | Public |
| Claflin College | Orangeburg, South Carolina | B | Private |
| Clark College | Atlanta, Georgia | B | Private |
| Clinton Junior College | Rock Hill, South Carolina | 2 | Private |
| Coahoma Junior College | Clarksdale, Mississippi | 2 | Public |
| Coppin State College | Baltimore, Maryland | M | Public |
| Daniel Payne College | Birmingham, Alabama | B | Private |
| Delaware State College | Dover, Delaware | B | Public |
| Dillard University | New Orleans, Louisiana | B | Private |
| D. C. Teacher's College | Washington, D. C. | B | Public |
| Edward Waters College | Jacksonville, Florida | B | Private |
| Elizabeth City State University | Elizabeth City, North Carolina | B | Public |
| Fayetteville State University | Fayetteville, North Carolina | B | Public |
| Fisk University | Nashville, Tennessee | M | Private |
| Florida A&M University | Tallahassee, Florida | M | Public |
| Florida Memorial College | Miami, Florida | B | Private |

LISTING A

(CONTINUED)

| NAME | CITY/STATE | LEVEL/HIGHEST OFFERING[1] | CONTROL |
|---|---|---|---|
| Fort Valley State College | Fort Valley, Georgia M | M | Public |
| Friendship Junior College | Rock Hill, South Carolina | 2 | Private |
| Grambling College | Grambling, Louisiana | M | Public |
| Hampton Institute | Hampton, Virginia | M | Private |
| Howard University | Washington, D. C. | D | Private |
| Huston-Tillotson College | Austin, Texas | B | Private |
| Interdenom. Theol. Center | Atlanta, Georgia | D | Private |
| Jackson State University | Jackson, Mississippi | M+ | Public |
| Jarvis Christian College | Hawkins, Texas | B | Private |
| Johnson C. Smith University | Charlotte, North Carolina | B | Private |
| Kentucky State University | Frankfort, Kentucky | M | Public |
| Knoxville College | Knoxville, Tennessee | B | Private |
| Lane College | Jackson, Tennessee | B | Private |
| Langston University | Langston, Oklahoma | B | Public |
| LeMoyne Owen College | Memphis, Tennessee | B | Private |
| Lincoln University (Pa.) | Lincoln University, Pennsylvania | B | Public |
| Livingstone College | Salisbury, North Carolinaa | B | Private |
| Lomax Hannon Junior College | Greenville, Alabama | 2 | Private |
| Mary Holmes College | West Point, Mississippi | 2 | Private |
| Meharry Medical College | Nashville, Tennessee | D | Private |
| Miles College | Birmingham, Alabama | B | Private |
| Mississippi Industrial College | Holly Springs, Mississippi | B | Private |
| Mississippi Valley State University | Itta Bena, Mississippi | M | Public |
| Morehouse College | Atlanta, Georgia | B | Private |
| Morgan State College | Baltimore, Maryland | M | Public |
| Morris College | Sumter, South Carolina | B | Private |
| Morris Brown College | Atlanta, Georgia | B | Private |
| Morristown College | Morristown, Tennessee | 2 | Private |
| Natchez Junior College | Natchez, Mississippi | 2 | Private |
| Norfolk State College | Norfolk, Virginia | M | Public |
| N.C. A&T State University | Greensboro, North Carolina | M+ | Public |

## LISTING A

(CONTINUED)

| NAME | CITY/STATE | LEVEL/HIGHEST OFFERING[1] | CONTROL |
|---|---|---|---|
| N. C. Central University | Durham, North Carolina | M | Public |
| Oakwood College | Huntsville, Alabama | B | Private |
| Paine College | Augusta, Georgia | B | Private |
| Paul Quinn College | Waco, Texas | B | Private |
| Philander Smith College | Little Rock, Arkansas | B | Private |
| Prairie View A&M University | Prairie View, Texas | M+ | Public |
| Prentiss N&I Institute | Prentiss, Mississippi | 2 | Private |
| Rust College | Holly Springs, Mississippi | B | Private |
| S. D. Bishop State Junior College | Mobile, Alabama | 2 | Public |
| Saint Augustine's College | Raleigh, North Carolina | B | Private |
| Saint Paul's College | Lawrenceville, Virginia | B | Private |
| Savannah State College | Savannah, Georgia | M | Public |
| Selma University | Selma, Alabama | B | Private |
| Shaw University | Raleigh, North Carolina | B | Private |
| Shorter College | Little Rock, Arkansas | 2 | Private |
| South Carolina State College | Orangeburg, South Carolina | M | Public |
| Southern University - Baton Rouge | Baton Rouge, Louisiana | M | Public |
| Southern University - New Orleans | New Orleans, Louisiana | B | Public |
| Southern University - Shreveport-Bossier | Shreveport, Louisiana | 2 | Public |
| Southwestern Christian College | Terrell, Texas | 2 | Private |
| Spelman College | Atlanta, Georgia | B | Private |
| Stillman College | Tuscaloosa, Alabama | B | Private |
| T.A. Lawson State Comm. College | Birmingham, Alabama | 2 | Public |
| Talladega College | Talladega, Alabama | B | Private |
| Tennessee State University | Nashville, Tennessee | M+ | Public |
| Texas College | Tyler, Texas | B | Private |
| Texas Southern University | Houston, Texas | D | Public |
| Tougaloo College | Tougaloo, Mississippi | B | Private |
| Tuskegee Institute | Tuskegee, Alabama | M | Private |

LISTING A

(CONTINUED)

| NAME | CITY/STATE | LEVEL/HIGHEST OFFERING[1] | CONTROL |
|---|---|---|---|
| University of Arkansas - Pine Bluff | Pine Bluff, Arkansas | B | Public |
| University of Maryland - Eastern Shore | Princess Anne, Maryland | B | Public |
| Utica Junior College | Utica, Mississippi | 2 | Public |
| Virginia College | Lynchburg, Virginia | 2 | Private |
| Virginia State College | Petersburg, Virginia | M | Public |
| Virginia Union University | Richmond, Virginia | P | Private |
| Voorhees College | Denmark, South Carolina | B | Private |
| Wilberforce University | Wilberforce, Ohio | B | Private |
| Wiley College | Marshall, Texas | B | Private |
| Winston-Salem State University | Winston-Salem, North Carolina | B | Public |
| Xavier University of Louisiana | New Orleans, Louisiana | M | Private |

1/
2 = 2 but less than 4 years

B = 4 or 5 year Baccalaureate

P = First Professional

M = Master's

M+ = Beyond Master's but less than Doctorate

D = Doctorate

* This listing of HBC's does not include Bluefield State College (WV); West Virginia State College (WV); and Lincoln University (MO) which are historically Black but are currently predominantly White institutions. It also omits Simmons University/Bible College (KY) which is not accredited and for which no data were available for this report; and Kittrell College (NC) and Saints College (MS) which have recently closed.

LISTING B

NEWER PREDOMINANTLY BLACK COLLEGES (NPBC'S)

PUBLIC (Total Number = 26)

4 Year Colleges:

Chicago State University (IL)
City Univ. of N.Y. - Medgar Evers (NY)
College of the Virgin Islands (VI)
Federal City College (DC)*
Harris Teachers College (MO)
Washington Technical Institute (DC)*

2 Year/Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes:

Atlanta Junior College (GA)
Beaufort Tech. Ed. Center (SC)
City Colleges of Chicago: (IL)
Kennedy-King; Loop; Malcolm X; Olive-Harvey
Community College of Baltimore (MD)
Community College of Philadelphia (PA)
Compton College (CA)
Cuyahoga Community College-Metro (OH)
Essex County College (NJ)
Highland Park Community College (MI)
State Community College (IL)
Los Angeles Southwest College (CA)
Roxbury Community College (MA)
St. Louis Community College - Forest Park (MO)
Shelby State Community College (TN)
Roanoke Chowan Tech. Institute (NC)
Trident Tech. College - Palmer (SC)
Wayne County Comm. College (MI)

PRIVATE (Total Number = 16)

4 Year Colleges:

American Baptist Theol. Seminary (TN)
Daniel H. Williams Univ. (IL)
Detroit Institute of Technology (MI)
Shaw College at Detroit (MI)
Strayer College (DC)

2 Year/Community Colleges/ Technical Institutes:

Bay College of Maryland (MD)
Central YMCA Community College (IL)
College for Human Service (NY)
Collegiate Institute (NY)
Durham College (NC)
Interboro Institute (NY)
Lewis Business College (MI)
Ministerial Institute & College (MS)
Nairobi College (CA)
Payne Theological Seminary (OH)
Taylor Business Institute (NY)

* As of Fall 1977 became a part of the University of the District of Columbia, which also includes D.C. Teachers College, an HBC.

---

DESIGNATION AS A NPBC IS BASED ON TOTAL AND FULL-TIME ENROLLMENTS BEING GREATER THAN 50% BLACK.

☆U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1978-260-934/2053

NOTES

I. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES AND UNIVERSITIES

1. The figures for white Americans in the same age cohort are 18 percent in 1967 and 15 percent today. Advisory Committee on Blacks, p. 11

2. ISE reports the following data:

Percent of population 25 to 34 years old who have completed four years of college or more, by race

| Year | Black total | White total |
|---|---|---|
| 1960 | 4.1 | 11.9 |
| 1966 | 5.7 | 14.9 |
| 1970 | 6.1 | 16.6 |
| 1976 | 11.3 | 23.5 |

3. This data was generously provided by Fred L. Crossland, Vice President of the Ford Foundation.

4. First Annual Report, National Advisory Committee, p. 13; Chronicle of Higher Education, fact-file, October.

5. ibid., p. 13.

6. op. cit., p. 21.

7. ISE factbook, p. ii.

8. op. cit., p. 22.

9. The following table shows the relative sizes of the historically Black colleges:

1976 Enrollment at Historically Black Institutions

Public -

41 institutions with enrollments of 141,476: average size is 3,451. (69.4% of enrollment in HBC's.)
8 institutions with enrollments under 1,500, with 9,307 students.
10 institutions with enrollments between 1,500 and 2,500, with 19,734 students.
13 institutions with enrollments between 2,500 and 5,000, with 46,011 students.
10 institutions with enrollments over 5,000, with 66,424 students.

Private -

63 institutions with enrollment of 62,324: average size is 989. (30.6% of enrollment in HBC's.)
14 institutions with enrollments under 500, with 1,430 students.
37 institutions with enrollments between 500 and 1,500, with 32,662 students.
8 institutions with enrollments between 1,500 and 2,500, with 13,620 students.
3 institutions with enrollments over 2,500, with 16,191 students.

Source: Chronicle of Higher Education.

10. ISE fact-book, Table II-10.

11. ISE fact-book, Table II-2.

12. ISE fact-book; Chronicle of Higher Education.

13. Data from the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission in the National Advisory Committee Annual Report, p. 26.

14. ISE fact-book, Table IV-7.

15. op. cit., p. iii.

II. THE UNIQUE CONTRIBUTION OF HISTORICALLY BLACK COLLEGES

1. Samuel Du Bois Cook, The Socio-Ethical Role and Responsibility of The Black College Graduate, in Willie and Edmonds, op. cit.

2. ibid.

3. Robert K. Merton, Social Theory and Social Structure, New York, 1949, p. 367.

APPENDIX A

1. Prior to 1965 cooperative agreements for the exchange of faculty had already existed between

   Tuskegee Institute and the University of Michigan
   Tougaloo College and Brown University
   Florida A & M and Florida State College
   North Carolina College - Durham and the University of Wisconsin

2. U.S. Congress-House Committee on Education and Labor. Higher Education Act of 1965. Hearings on HR 3220, 89th Congress, first session, 1965.

3. A forceful and persuasive account of the history, administration, finances and management as well as the roles and missions of the historically Black colleges is given in "Black Colleges in America," edited by Charles V. Willie and Ronald R. Edmonds. Recent reviews of the Title III program from a policy perspective are available in Dr. Henry E. Cobb's "Report of the Study of the Developing Institutions Program" and "Assessing the Federal Program for Strengthening Developing Institutions of Higher Education" prepared by the General Accounting Office in 1975. Among the histories of the historically Black colleges and higher education in the Black community in general are A History of Negro Education in the South by Henry Allen Bullock and Predominantly Negro Colleges in Transition by Earl J. McGrath. See also "The Future of Black Colleges," Daedalus, Summer, 1971.

4. See Hodgkinson, H. and Schenkel, W., A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act, Berkeley, 1974.

5. From Jacobs, F. and Tingley, T., The Evolution of Eligibility Criteria for Title III of the Higher Education Act of 1965. Harvard University, Graduate School of Education, Cambridge, 1977.

6. Sullivan, O., Special Report: Black Colleges - Midway Toward a New Era, Ford Foundation LETTER, New York, Feb. 1, 1975.

7. U.S. Controller General, Report to the Congress: Assessing the Federal Program for Strengthening Developing Institutions of Higher Education. G.A.O. Publication MWD-76-1, 1975, p. ii.

8. op. cit., p. 13.

9. ibid.

10. Federal Register, Department of HEW, Office of Education, Strengthening Developing Institutions Program, November 2, 1978, Part II, p, 51263.

11. H. Hodgkinson and W. Schenkel, A Study of Title III of the Higher Education Act, Berkeley, 1974.